



KING COUNTY HOUSING AUTHORITY

MAKING TRANSITION WORK

**ANNUAL REPORT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005**

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Section I: Households Served	3
A. Current Tenants and Participants	3
B. Applicants	5
Section II: Occupancy Policies	6
A. Policy Processes.....	6
B. Deconcentration of Low-Income Households	6
C. MTW Policy Initiatives.....	7
Section III: Changes in Housing Stock	9
Section IV: Sources and Amounts of Funding	10
A. Sources and Planned vs. Actual Funding Amounts in the Consolidated MTW Budget	10
B. Sources and Amounts of Funding Outside the Consolidated MTW Budget	10
C. Explanation of the Differences between Projected and Actual Funding	11
Section V: Uses of Funds	13
A. Planned Expenditures and Changes in Expenses from the FY2005 Budget	13
B. Level and Adequacy of Reserves for the Public Housing and Section 8 Programs	14
Section VI. Capital Planning	15
A. Comprehensive Needs Assessment System.....	15
B. Ten-Year Capital Work Plan.....	15
Section VII: Owned and Managed Units	18
A. Vacancy Rates.....	18
B. Rent Collections	19
C. Work Orders.....	19
D. HQS Inspections	19
E. Security.....	19
F. MTW Initiatives to Improve Operational Efficiency	20
G. Site-Based Management Pilot.....	20
H. Policy Efforts Leading to Greater Efficiency	20

Section VIII: Leased Housing	22
A. Lease-Up Rates	22
B. Ensuring Rent Reasonableness	22
C. Expanding Housing Opportunities and Deconcentration.....	22
D. Other MTW Demonstration Initiatives	23
E. Inspection Strategy	25
Section IX: Resident Programs	26
A. Support for Early Childhood Learning and Youth Recreation.....	26
B. Self-Sufficiency Services and Programs	26
C. Addressing the Needs of Senior and Younger Disabled Populations	28
D. Reasonable Accommodations	29
E. Supportive Housing through KCHA’s Section 8 Project-Based Assistance Program.....	29

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The end of FY 2005 marks the conclusion of KCHA's first full year of participation in the Department of Housing and Urban Development's Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program. As a high performing Housing Authority, the MTW program affords KCHA the flexibility to move away from HUD prescribed rules and regulations in favor of a programs, policies and procedures designed to address local needs and circumstances. Given the current shift in Federal funding priorities away from the Public Housing and Section 8 Programs, the flexibility of the MTW demonstration has proved integral to the Authority's ability to accomplish its mission to serve families with the greatest need while pursuing KCHA program objectives including:

- ❑ Increased housing choices for KCHA clients.
- ❑ Increased client self-sufficiency – leading to more positive transitions out of assisted housing, including homeownership.
- ❑ Increased operational efficiency and financial stability for KCHA programs.
- ❑ Preserving and increasing affordable housing opportunities for the region.

Under the MTW demonstration program, KCHA is required to submit an Annual Report to HUD documenting activities pursued during the year, along with data regarding client demographics, financial management, capital projects, and property management performance. The information provided is designed to allow HUD to evaluate the extent to which the Authority has accomplished the goals of the Demonstration and the Annual MTW Plan. This report is the Authority's FY 2005 Annual Report to HUD, documenting activities pursued during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2004 and ending on June 30, 2005. The report highlights the Authority's accomplishments during the fiscal year in pursuit of its MTW program goals, including:

- ❑ Continued to serve roughly equal numbers of households, with an actual increase, from 10,512 to 10,896, of households served from the start of the MTW Program to the end of FY 2005.
- ❑ Continued to focus KCHA resources on the poorest and most at-risk households in the region. In FY '05, 95% of households (a 4% increase) in the Section 8 program reported incomes below 30% of AMI.
- ❑ Continued to move public housing residents and Section 8 participants along the path to self-sufficiency. In FY '05, the percentage of public housing residents in Temporary Aid to Needy Families (TANF) declined from 21% to 18%.
- ❑ Assisted families in leaving Federally subsidized housing and achieving homeownership. In FY '05, through a combination of ROSS, HOPE VI, FSS and public housing funded programs, over 17 public housing residents and program participants purchased homes.
- ❑ Implemented and expanded KCHA's locally designed Section 8 project basing initiative. The project based Section 8 program was utilized during FY 2005 to bring on-line replacement housing for the Park Lake Homes HOPE VI initiative, expand the region's supply of housing for homeless families under the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation's Sound Families Program and revitalize existing affordable housing.
- ❑ Successfully implemented a demonstration program moving the management of public housing developments to a site based private sector model. Monitored results and established a plan for expansion of the pilot to all KCHA regions during FY 2006.
- ❑ Worked with a cross section of staff, residents and community stakeholders to review of potential changes to the Public Housing Waiting List system. Through input and feedback

received, developed a system that incorporated the use of Site-specific Waiting Lists together with Regional Waiting Lists to increase applicant choice in determining where they will reside while maintaining the ability to address urgent housing needs and complementing KCHA's shift to site-based management of public housing properties.

- ❑ In conjunction with changes to the Public Housing Waiting List system, worked to review and develop final recommendations for modifications to KCHA's approved Local Preferences including (1) expanding the definition of "urgent need" to households whose income is at or below 30% of the Area Median income and (2) establishing a "set-aside" preference to applicants who have graduated from the Sound Families Housing program operated in partnership with KCHA, the Gates Foundation and local service providers.
- ❑ Progress toward the development of revised Rent Policies for the Public Housing Program, working with staff, community stakeholders and residents in conducting focus groups to encourage discussion and obtain feedback on policy options and their impact upon the community.
- ❑ Utilized MTW authority to recommend and implement streamlining and cost savings measures under the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan including:
 - Implementation of a policy requiring households to provide written notice to vacate prior to the 20th day of the intended vacated month;
 - Implementation of a policy that removes the ability of a household to receive double subsidy when moving to a new rental unit mid-month;
 - Implementation of a policy limiting the frequency under which rent reasonableness determinations completed;
 - Implementation of policy changes to allow self-certification of monthly co-payments for state-subsidized child care in the amount of \$50 or less;
 - Implementation of a provision that excludes from income calculation funds provided by DSHS to offset increased "shared housing" costs for disabled households.
 - Authorization for implementation of changes to the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program designed to address projected shortfalls in program funding, including revisions in the payment standards, occupancy standards, freezing of rents and an increase in allowable household contributions.
- ❑ Utilized the authority granted under the MTW demonstration to serve as its own ESCO. KCHA executed a contract with Siemens to leverage \$4 million in capital for energy improvements and has commenced installation of energy conservation measures throughout its public housing inventory. Fast-tracking of toilet replacements in over 3,000 public housing units has enabled significant utility rebates and an immediate reduction in water bills.

Copies of Board approved resolutions that further outline the policy and procedural changes approved by KCHA during the fiscal year are incorporated into and included as an attachment to this Report.

Of final note, during FY 2005 KCHA requested approval of Amendment Number 2 to its HUD approved MTW agreement allowing for the consolidation of all KCHA non-Mainstream vouchers into a single block grant. Although formal approval of the amendment was not received until August 2005 (during FY 2006) the approval was granted retroactive to February 2005. As a result, the data and financial information presented in this Report reflects the approved consolidation.

SECTION I: HOUSEHOLDS SERVED

Serving those most in need is a strategic goal of KCHA's MTW Demonstration. Policies to expand access to housing for homeless households and individuals with disabilities under the Public Housing and Section 8 Program are examples of the Authority's ongoing commitment to the county's neediest households. The number and characteristics of applicants and residents served by the KCHA's Public Housing and Section 8 Programs are compared below to the projections included in the 2005 MTW Plan.

A. CURRENT TENANTS AND PARTICIPANTS

Public Housing

The differences in the numbers and characteristics of public housing households served in FY2005 compared to households served at the beginning of the fiscal year reflected in Appendixes A-F are primarily attributable to a single factor: The relocation of residents from Park Lake Homes I as the redevelopment of the site under HUD's HOPE VI reconstruction program progresses. The reduction of public housing units has been matched one-for-one with increases in Housing Choice Vouchers for these clients.

Unit Sizes. Appendix A reflects approximately 270 fewer households (33 one-bedroom, 142 two-bedroom households and 85 three-bedroom households) in occupancy at the end of FY 2005.

Household Type. KCHA's Designation Plan, which allocates up to 78% of the units within the Authority's Mixed Population developments to elderly and near-elderly (age 55-62) households, has become an effective tool in balancing the housing needs of elderly and disabled households within units formerly designated as "elderly only" developments. Since implementation of the Designation Plan, KCHA's percentage of elderly households has stabilized at around 67%. Appendix S provides detailed information regarding the current status of elderly and disabled populations in each of KCHA's Mixed Population buildings

Although not affected by KCHA's Designation Plan, Appendix A shows a slight decrease in the number and % of disabled households living within KCHA's family communities. As previously noted, this is largely the result of shift to Section 8 of households impacted by the HOPE VI Program at Park Lake Homes, a community that historically housed a large number of disabled residents to the Section 8 Program.

Race and Ethnicity. As expected, the policy changes implemented in FY2005 did not result in a significant change in the racial/ethnic make-up of the public housing developments. However, as families have relocated from Park Lake Homes, a slight shift in the overall population percentages has occurred. The increase in the percentage of white households (3%) and small decrease in the percentage of Asian (3%) households in the family communities are due mainly to the shift of a large number of households from Park Lake Homes to Section 8 vouchers. This development had a significantly higher percentage of Asian households (50%) compared to the overall family public housing population (25%).

Section 8

Appendices G-I show the number and characteristics of Section 8 households served in KCHA's jurisdiction compared with those reflected in the Authority's 2005 MTW Plan. As indicated, the program grew slightly (120 households) as a result of the continued transition of families out of Park Lake Homes with the use of HOPE VI relocation vouchers and the execution of HAP contracts for replacement housing coming on-line.

During FY2005, Housing Agencies nationwide began to implement policies restricting Section 8 participants from utilizing the portability feature of their Section 8 Voucher in jurisdictions with established Payments Standards higher than their own. The measure allows Housing Authorities to control costs in the face of continued federal funding shortfalls and has resulted in an observed decrease in the number of "port-ins" to KCHA's jurisdiction. Currently, KCHA has not limited voucher portability in this manner; as a result the number of "port-outs" from KCHA's portfolio increased slightly during FY2005 as voucher holders continued to exercise these mobility options of the Section 8 program.

Unit Sizes. End of year data shows only a slight change in the distribution of unit sizes among Section 8 participants. The 2% increase in the number of 1 bedroom households served is in part attributable to KCHA's moratorium on the issuance of vouchers to applicants from the general Section 8 waiting list, a measure implemented as a means of controlling program costs. As designed, the freeze did not affect Special Purpose vouchers - primarily vouchers for disabled households issued in conjunction with the Allocation program. Historically, vouchers issued for this purpose are utilized by households who qualify for 1-bedroom units. The increase in 1-bedroom households is offset by a smaller, 1% decrease in the number of 3-bedroom households. The decrease is attributed to cost savings measures implemented in FY2005, which included modification of the program's occupancy standards and resulted in a slight shift in bedroom size allocations.

Household Type. Unlike the previous year (FY2004), which was largely impacted by KCHA's lease-up of Allocation Vouchers received in 2003, Appendix G shows no significant change in the distribution of household types among its Section 8 participants.

Income Group. Under the terms of KCHA's MTW Agreement, the Authority is obligated to ensure that a minimum of 75 percent of households served have incomes below 50 percent of the Area's Median Income (AMI). The Authority continues to serve a very high percentage of extremely low-income households. At the end of FY2005, more than 95% of the households participating in the Section 8 program reported income below 30% of AMI, an increase of more than 4% since 2003. The increased number of extremely low-income families reflects the overall economic environment of the greater King County region as well as KCHA's continued focus on serving those most in need through its housing preference policies. Like the Public Housing Program, nearly 90 percent of new admissions to the Section 8 program had incomes less than 30 percent of the AMI.

Race and Ethnicity. The racial and ethnic composition of the Section 8 Program did not change significantly from numbers reported in the prior fiscal year. The slight increase (2%) in the number of Latino households reported at the end of FY2005 is likely the result of the correction

of family data incorrectly converted when KCHA implemented a new computer system in mid-2004.

B. APPLICANTS

Appendixes K - R provide information about the public housing and Section 8 waiting lists. The Section 8 waiting list has been closed since July 2002. Public housing waiting lists remain open.

The number of applicants reported as “Active” on KCHA’s Public Housing waiting list has continued to grow as a result of KCHA’s modified approach to waiting list management, which does not require regular check-in or bi-annual purging of the waiting list. This list will be updated by contacting each household in 2006 as part of the restructuring of the waiting list process under the site-based management initiative. In addition, steadily rising housing costs in the King County region has had an impact on the number of households seeking federal public housing assistance. As FY2005 closed, KCHA’s Public Housing waiting list included a total of 5,883 households, an increase of approximately 31% over the prior year.

Despite being closed, the Section 8 waiting lists contained more than 4,500 applicants at the end of the year. As previously noted, during FY2005, KCHA suspended issuing vouchers to applicants from the general Section 8 waiting list in response to budgetary shortfalls created through Federal funding cutbacks.

A review of Public Housing and Section 8 Voucher program applicant demographics does not indicate any significant shift in the characteristics of families waiting for federal housing assistance through KCHA.

SECTION II: OCCUPANCY POLICIES

The Authority developed, adopted and implemented a number of occupancy policies affecting the Public Housing and Section 8 programs and is in the process of developing new rent policies. These policies and program changes are intended to:

- ☐ Improve the quality of life of KCHA clients.
- ☐ Increase the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of administering the programs.
- ☐ Increase the housing choices of low-income households.
- ☐ Support residents in their efforts to become self-sufficient.

A. POLICY PROCESSES

KCHA staff at all levels and the Resident Advisory Board are consulted on all proposed policy and program changes before KCHA's Board considers policy proposals. In addition, proposals that may result in negative impacts on residents or applicants are reviewed through a process that includes relevant stakeholders. For example, if a policy could result in higher housing costs for KCHA clients, participation from residents, advocates, and service providers is invited and encouraged as early as possible in the policy development process. On the other hand, if changes are purely administrative and designed to increase internal administrative efficiency and the Authority holds a high level of confidence that residents will not be negatively impacted, only staff and the Resident Advisory Board are consulted.

B. DECONCENTRATION OF LOW-INCOME HOUSEHOLDS

In Public Housing, the most significant effort to reduce poverty concentrations currently underway is the revitalization of the Authority's largest family development - Park Lake Homes I - into a new mixed-income neighborhood – under the HOPE VI Program. Relocation of residents is in full swing. Over 250 Park Lake Homes units will be replaced off-site in areas of King County with better resourced school districts, stronger employment opportunities, and lower poverty rates. Through KCHA's new Section 8 Project-Based Assistance Program, replacement of demolished units has begun, to date almost exclusively in East King County, the area of King County with the lowest poverty rates.

Other efforts to increase the mix of incomes in public housing have focused on economic self-sufficiency programs for existing residents. Public housing has seen ongoing reductions in the percentage of family households who list Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) as their primary source of income – down to 18% overall from 21% the prior year.

Although KCHA has implemented a Deconcentration policy consistent with HUD requirements, concentrations of extremely low-income households have not reached a level that requires KCHA to skip such households on the waiting list

The Section 8 Program continues to offer higher rent subsidies (exception rents) in higher cost rental markets in order to enable participants to rent in these areas and to assist in lessening concentrations of low-income households in higher poverty areas of King County. A total of 1,200 Section 8 households currently reside in exception rent areas.

C. MTW POLICY INITIATIVES

The following policy/program changes were explored and/or adopted during FY2005:

1. Site-Based Public Housing Waiting Lists. Following implementation of site-based waiting lists for two of its developments: Pickering Court (Snoqualmie) and Casa Madrona (Olympia), KCHA began to explore the feasibility of implementing Site-based waiting lists throughout its jurisdiction. Working with staff, residents and community stakeholders KCHA developed initial policy guidelines that are expected to reduce waiting list administration costs while offering applicants an opportunity to choose the development in which they will live.

Final policy recommendations had not been completed at the end of the fiscal year, thus policy development on this subject will be carried forward into the next fiscal year (FY 2006).

2. Section 8 Project-Basing. KCHA is expanding the amount of Project Based Assistance available in order to increase housing opportunities for extremely low-income households in three primary categories: 1) Local affordable housing preservation; 2) Supportive Housing with wrap-around services; and 3) Replacement Housing under the HOPE VI initiative. Shown below is a list of contracts executed in FY 05 in each of these categories:

Local Affordable Housing Preservation: 65 units

<i>Project</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<i>Population Served</i>	<i>Units</i>
Harrison House	KCHA	Seniors	47
Valley Park	Green River Homes, LLC	Families	16

Supportive Housing with wrap-around Services: 54 units

<i>Project</i>	<i>Owner</i>	<i>Population Served</i>	<i>Units</i>
Alpine Ridge	Alpine Ridge, LLC	Homeless Families	15
East Village Transitional (AHAP)	East Village, LLC	Homeless Families	10
The Willows	Community Psychiatric Clinic	Homeless Families	15
Valley Park	Green River Homes, LLC	Homeless Families & Individuals with Disabilities	14

3. Rent Policies and Other Changes Related to Self-Sufficiency

The Authority has continued to engage in an extensive process of exploring changes to the Public Housing and Section 8 Program's Rent Policies as well as changes to the Family Self-Sufficiency Program (FSS). During FY 2005, numerous meetings with staff were conducted to help identify and define problems with the current policies, develop policy goals and explore potential alternatives to the current system. In addition, KCHA has undertaken outreach efforts to allow residents, service providers and advocates for low-income families to participate in meetings regarding potential rent structuring. As part of this effort, KCHA has included specific language based meetings to assist participants who do not consider English their primary language. The Resident Advisory Board has been briefed on these efforts on an ongoing basis.

It is the Housing Authority's goal that any Rent Policy changes be designed to encourage employment and income progression among program residents. This initiative is part of a broader effort to strengthen the self-sufficiency outcomes for all KCHA clients. Changes to the FSS program and existing self-sufficiency programs serving public housing residents will improve participants' chances of obtaining jobs and increasing their incomes. These changes will also be designed to increase cost-effectiveness and sharpen the focus on outcome based service delivery.

This initiative will move forward for continued review and analysis during FY 2006.

4. Public Housing Local Preferences. In concert with changes to the Public Housing Waiting List System, during FY 2005 staff explored and developed recommendations for modification of KCHA's approved Local Preferences. Through revised policies, KCHA will seek to increase program access to applicants with income below 30% of AMI, while reducing waiting list administrative costs.

Final policy recommendations will be brought forward during the next fiscal year and implemented along with approved modifications to the Authority's Waiting List system.

5. Other Changes. A number of other changes, focused on streamlining and cost savings measures for the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program were also reviewed and/or implemented during FY2005. These changes will be discussed in Section VIII of this Report.

SECTION III: CHANGES IN HOUSING STOCK

A strategic goal of KCHA's MTW Demonstration is to preserve and increase the availability of affordable housing in King County. The Authority particularly wants to ensure that the number of units serving extremely low-income households does not decrease, especially during the redevelopment of Park Lake Homes I. The table below provides information about the total number of KCHA housing units projected to be available and the actual number of units available at the end of FY 2005. These numbers represent the gross number of units in these programs.

Housing Program	Projected	Actual
Section 8 Vouchers	6,730	6,850
Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) Units	3,113	2,985
Section 8 New Construction Buildings	174	174
Preservation Program Buildings	271	271
TOTAL KCHA UNITS	10,288	10,280

KCHA's overall program projections for FY 2005 turned out to be very accurate. The decrease in the number of Public Housing program units (128 units) is offset by a similar increase (120 units) available under the Section 8 program. The shift is a result of KCHA's activities at Park Lake Homes as families are transitioned out of the development (using Section 8 Replacement vouchers) in advance of planned HOPE VI demolition at the site. The public housing numbers include units that are available for resident occupancy, units being used to accommodate agencies serving KCHA residents, and 10 units destroyed by fire at Springwood Apartments in July 2004. The Housing Authority intends to rebuild these units and as a result has not requested to have them deleted from its inventory. The Section 8 numbers reflect all vouchers KCHA is authorized to issue.

SECTION IV: SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF FUNDING

This Section compares the projected and actual FY 2005 sources and amounts of funding included in the consolidated MTW budget statement, the sources and amounts of funding outside the consolidated MTW budget and the Consolidated Budget Statement. This Section also includes the Authority's Consolidated Financial Statement for FY 2005. Please note that the following figures represent un-audited fiscal year end financial data. The audited Consolidated Financial Statement for FY2005 will be available in March 2006.

A. SOURCES AND PLANNED VS. ACTUAL FUNDING AMOUNTS IN THE CONSOLIDATED MTW BUDGET

The following table compares the revenues projected in the FY 2005 MTW Plan with the actual revenues received by KCHA for FY 2005 for the Section 8 Housing Choice Vouchers and Public Housing Programs.

PROJECTED REVENUES	FY2005 BUDGET	FY2005 ACTUAL
Dwelling Rental Income	\$ 7,078,619	\$ 7,506,419
Investment Income	69,896	221,858
Other Income	393,404	598,739
Section 8 Block Grant	11,849,176	32,095,407
Section 8 Subsidy and Port/Admin Fees	51,791,880	30,313,969
Capital Subsidy (CFP all years)	9,114,950	4,945,047
Operating Subsidy (PH)	7,649,809	8,024,155
Total Revenues	\$ 87,947,734	\$ 83,705,594

B. SOURCES AND AMOUNTS OF FUNDING OUTSIDE THE CONSOLIDATED MTW BUDGET

KCHA operates a Section 8 New Construction Program that is not part of the MTW Demonstration. Its projected and actual revenues are included in the table below. The table also reflects projected revenues of non-Capital Fund Grants.

PROJECTED REVENUES	FY2005 BUDGET	FY2005 ACTUAL
Dwelling Rental Income	\$ 1,291,470	\$ 1,278,107
Investment Income	308,562	342,531
Other Income	185,000	127,394
Section 8 Subsidy and Admin Fee	3,107,196	2,864,401
Capital Subsidy	0	-
Operating Subsidy	0	-
Grants (non CFP)	34,296,253	10,649,487
Total Revenues	\$39,188,481	\$ 15,261,919

Consolidated Budget Statement:

PROJECTED REVENUES	FY2005 BUDGET	FY2005 ACTUAL
Dwelling Rental Income	\$ 8,370,089	\$ 8,784,526
Investment Income	378,458	564,388
Other Income	578,404	726,133
Section 8 Block Grant	11,849,176	32,095,407
Section 8 Subsidy and Admin Fee	54,899,076	33,178,370
Capital Subsidy	9,114,950	4,945,047
Operating Subsidy	7,649,809	8,024,155
Grants	34,296,253	10,649,487
Total Revenues	\$ 127,136,215	\$ 98,967,513

C. EXPLANATION OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROJECTED AND ACTUAL FUNDING

The Authority projected its FY 2005 MTW Budget on actual results from December 2003, adjusted for inflation and certain other assumptions. This method of estimating caused some significant differences between the final results as of June 30, 2005 as follows:

- ❑ Dwell rent is 6% higher than budget. The Authority had assumed an earlier vacate and demolition of its HOPE VI units than was experienced, resulting in a higher number of unit months' rent received. In addition, the economy in King County began to recover (evidenced by a tightening market for all multifamily apartment units); per unit rents across the board in public housing inched up by 2%. No increase had been forecast.
- ❑ Investment returns improved markedly during FY 2005 following a series of quarterly moves by the Federal Reserve Board. KCHA keeps most of its funds in liquid accounts, which benefited from these increases in short term interest rates. Due to an expansion of the MTW block grant within Section 8, as well as the more favorable results in Public Housing, the Authority had more funds to invest, resulting in an increase in interest earnings.
- ❑ Other Income (FY 2005 Actual) includes the receipts from the Family Self Sufficiency grant that had been budgeted on the Section 8 Subsidy line.
- ❑ Effective in February 2005, KCHA consolidated all of its non-Mainstream vouchers into a single block grant, as reflected in Amendment Number 2 to its MTW Agreement. This caused a shifting of housing assistance payments and administrative fees between the block grant and non-block grant line items of the Plan and Report for Section 8.
- ❑ Capital Subsidy reflects amounts spent, not eligibility. While the Authority was granted the anticipated amounts of its Capital Fund, the expenditure rate was slowed down by the complexity of several major projects undertaken, which delayed billing into the beginning of FY2006. The Authority remains on track to expend all available funds in a timely manner.

- ❑ Operating Subsidy was increased during FY 2005 by a decline in the HUD issued proration factor; KCHA received a greater percentage of the funds it was eligible to receive.
- ❑ The majority of the Grant line item budget reflected anticipated costs of the HOPE VI project. At the time the budget was undertaken, more expenses were expected to be incurred in FY 2004; these were actually paid in FY 2005. As of the date of this writing, infrastructure is complete for the current phase and vertical construction is well underway.

New Investment Strategies: KCHA managed its cash flow more closely in FY 2005. All funds remained in an interest bearing account managed by the State of Washington, with transfers to checking accounts “just in time” throughout the year. This improvement in cash flow management is attributable to investment policy change previously authorized under the MTW initiative. In June 2005, KCHA refinanced a pool of seven non-subsidized housing developments, resulting in a significant interest savings to the Authority, as well as release of restricted reserves required by the prior indentures. Although these developments are not part of the MTW agreement, the unrestricted funds which became available will facilitate the expansion of KCHA’s portfolio of workforce housing. One new development, Bellepark Apartments (118 units) was added during the year.

SECTION V: USES OF FUNDS

This Section compares FY 2005 budgeted expenditures with actual FY 2005 expenditures by line item. This Section also identifies the level and adequacy of reserve balance at the end of FY 2005. Please note that the following figures represent unaudited fiscal year end financial data.

A. PLANNED EXPENDITURES AND CHANGES IN EXPENSES FROM THE FY2005 BUDGET

Following are the amounts that were budgeted in FY 2005 as compared to actual expenditures in FY 2005 by line item.

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES	FY2005 BUDGET	FY2005 ACTUAL
Administration and General	\$ 14,996,140	\$ 13,289,451
Housing Assistance Payments	46,706,308	26,118,211
Section 8 Block Grant HAP	11,849,176	30,576,567
Utilities	3,411,042	2,906,722
Maintenance and Contracts	5,106,548	4,893,634
Capital Projects	7,600,000	3,377,825
Total Expenses	\$ 89,669,214	\$ 81,162,411

Description of the Changes in the Budgeted Activities in FY 2005:

The Authority's actual overall expenses varied from the original budget in specific areas for the following reasons:

- ❑ Administrative and General budgeted expenses included some professional fees anticipated to be expensed as part of the Capital Fund Program; however these expenses were capitalized as integral parts of the projects as is appropriate under GAAP
- ❑ Following the amendment of KCHA's MTW contract, most vouchers were placed in the Block Grant as of February 1, 2005. KCHA did not receive the amounts anticipated in its overall Section 8 budget due to HUD's funding availability and lack of an inflation factor (AAF equal to 1.00) for calendar year 2005. Some increase in funding had been anticipated.
- ❑ KCHA received permission to act as its own ESCO in its MTW agreement. Early results were experienced in FY 2005 with an overall decline in water usage at its public housing developments. In addition, the units demolished at the HOPE VI site had a higher impact on cost reduction than anticipated.
- ❑ Capital Projects: See comment in Section IV regarding expenditure rates for the CFP.

Conversion of Existing Software: The Authority converted its core software system in May 2004. During FY 2005, use of the software continued to improve, with all modules purchased being fully used by all departments. The Authority hired a contract programmer who responded to departmental requests for upgrades and improvements to the basic package. It also trained

two of its in-house personnel to manage the conversion and ongoing needs of the software. All effected staff were trained in use of Crystal Reports which will enable KCHA to extract much more management information from the system than the previous software allowed, including improved and far more timely site financial reports in support of the site-based management initiative. The year-end closing process for FY 2004 took more than a week; by the closing of FY 2005, this process took less than one day.

Ongoing Review of Energy Costs: Following lengthy contract negotiations, KCHA contracted with Siemens Building Technologies to be its energy partner in installing energy conservation measures throughout its public housing inventory. This process is continuing with a projected completion date of approximately May 2006. As of this date, over 3,300 water efficient toilets have been installed and installation is underway for better thermostats and energy efficient lighting fixtures at all sites. In addition, Siemens is installing individual water meters at KCHA's family developments and has taken additional steps to reduce outside watering at those same buildings.

B. LEVEL AND ADEQUACY OF RESERVES FOR THE PUBLIC HOUSING AND SECTION 8 PROGRAMS

Following are the amounts that were budgeted in FY 2005 as reserve balances as compared to actual reserve balances by line item at the end of the year:

FISCAL YEAR 2005	BUDGETED RESERVE BALANCES	RESERVE BALANCES AT END OF YEAR
Public Housing	\$ 5,584,056	\$ 6,271,360
Section 8 Fee Reserve	1,078,037	4,077,544
Section 8 Project Reserve	900,657	632,247
Total Reserves	\$ 7,562,750	\$ 10,981,151

Reserves were higher than budgeted in both Section 8 and Public Housing. Higher interest rates, a modest increase in tenant rent contributions and expense control (particularly in utilities) have all resulted in higher cash flow to the Authority than anticipated in Public Housing. At the time that projections for Section 8 year-end cash were developed, it was unclear as to the amount and rate at which Block grant funds might accumulate to the Authority. The addition of 5,585 vouchers to the block grant base allowed KCHA to keep excess HAP for the purposes of its MTW agreement. Some of the steps taken by the Authority to reduce landlord payments to address reductions in HUD funding resulted in KCHA's ability to build a reserve against future shortfalls. Although KCHA was given \$632 thousand in project reserves at the inception of its agreement, such reserves reflect less than one week's HAP. The current Fee Reserves are nearly four weeks, an amount considered far more adequate to support the Section 8 operations.

SECTION VI. CAPITAL PLANNING

A. COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT SYSTEM

The King County Housing Authority has developed and implemented an in-house comprehensive needs assessment (CNA) inspection program and database system that includes all of KCHA's federally assisted properties. This in-house program helps the agency identify:

- ☐ The condition of properties.
- ☐ Completed capital improvement work.
- ☐ New capital improvement work needed to upgrade and maintain the life of the property.
- ☐ All associated costs.

KCHA has used the CNA to generate complete capital replacement and construction schedules for its public housing and other housing properties.

B. TEN-YEAR CAPITAL WORK PLAN

Based on the CNA, the Authority has developed a 10-year work plan (FY 2003 to FY 2012) to address the highest priorities among the identified capital needs for public housing developments. The work plan provides a description, schedule (year), and projected costs of all capital projects that will be undertaken during the next 10 years. The total cost for projects in the 10-year plan is approximately \$57.4 million based on current estimates. These estimates are updated annually. The work plan also identifies all capital needs that are deferred beyond 2012. Based on current costs, identified capital needs total just more than \$70 million. KCHA's ability to complete scheduled work over the next 10 years is dependent on sustained levels of annual appropriations for the Capital Fund by Congress. Some of the major needs addressed in FY2005 include:

- ☐ **Park Lake Homes Redevelopment.** The Authority received a HOPE VI Revitalization Grant in 2001 for the Park Lake Homes I community and is currently underway with the first phase of vertical construction. This 92 acre distressed community will be completely redeveloped into a mixed-income neighborhood (Greenbridge) of public housing and market rate rentals as well as homeownership opportunities for a broad spectrum of household incomes. Three hundred public housing units will be replaced on site, and 269 will be replaced elsewhere on a one-for-one basis with units subsidized through project-based Section 8 assistance. FY2005 activities included permitting, demolition, site grading, infrastructure construction and bidding of the first phase of rental housing. Phase I and II housing construction will occur in FY 2006, with the second phases of demolition and infrastructure construction occurring in FY2007.

- ❑ **Fire and Life/Safety Upgrades in Mixed-Population Buildings.** The Authority continues to move forward on its the multi-year plan to update the Fire and Life/Safety systems in all its mixed-population buildings which includes the installation of modern fire alarm and new fire sprinkler systems in all multistory buildings for the elderly and the disabled . This work has been completed at 12 public housing sites with the remaining 7 buildings to be completed at a rate of one to two buildings per year. In FY 2005, the focus was on completing Burien Park, a wood framed 108 unit Section 8 New Construction building for the elderly in Burien, Washington that lacked modern fire alarm and sprinkler systems.
- ❑ **Springwood Apartments Revitalization.** This aging and physically distressed 333 unit property will undergo a total renovation over a multi-year period. Because Capital Fund resources are inadequate to fund this project, KCHA continues to explore mixed financing approaches as the means to fund this initiative. Master planning with conceptual level scope of work was completed. The development of cost estimates, budgets and a financial model for the revitalization plan has commenced.
- ❑ **New Signage.** New modern signage, including monument, way finding, directional, and unit signs were installed included in the scope of work for Yardley Arms and Southridge House.
- ❑ **Springwood Recreation Center.** Design work was completed in FY 2005 for the expansion of an existing one-story, 5,350 square foot community building into a two-story, 10,845 square foot complex that includes a gymnasium, commercial kitchen facilities, and a multi purpose commons at the Springwood Apartments Development in Kent. Completion of construction will occur in FY '07.
- ❑ **Other Major Multi-Year Projects.** KCHA is also undertaking extensive energy efficiency and interior unit rehabilitation projects. In FY 2005, a \$3.9 million partnership was executed with Siemens Building Technologies. The project commenced in FY2005 and is scheduled for completion by May 2006. In addition, the Authority completed the interior remodel of three family developments: Burndale Homes, a 50-unit site in Auburn, Pickering Court, a 30-unit site in Snoqualmie, and Riverton Terrace a 30-unit development located in Tukwila, Washington.

FY 2005 Capital Projects for Public Housing

Projected/Obligated/Actual Expenditures by Property

Community	Summary of Work Activities	Projected Construction	CFP Obligated FY2005	CFP Spent in FY2005	Status and Explanation
2-39 College Place	Crawl space insulation & structural upgrades	\$ 90,000	0	0	COMPLETED. Project completed using CDBG and Weatherization funds. No CFP funds were necessary.
2-26 Burndale Homes	Continuation of the interior remodel of 50	\$1,054,550	\$849,349	\$849,349	COMPLETED

	units.				
2-22 Yardley Arms	Fire and life safety upgrades including domestic water, community spaces remodel, and upgrading heating systems.	\$1,600,000	\$1,970,959	0	COMMENCED Construction started in June 2005 under GC/CM contract.
2-43 Pickering Court	Continuation of the interior remodel and modernization of 30 units.	\$672,730	\$604,395	\$604,395	COMPLETED
2-20 Southridge House	Fire and life safety upgrades including domestic water, community spaces remodel, upgrading heating systems, and exterior improvements.	\$1,800,000	\$2,548,247	0	COMMENCED Construction started in June 2005 under GC/CM contract.
2-18 Riverton Terrace	Continuation of the interior remodel and modernization of 30 family units.	\$672,720	\$667,849	\$667,849	COMPLETED
2-21 Casa Juanita	Infrastructure improvements	\$250,000	\$0	0	Bids received in excess of budget. Project scope modified and deferred to FY2006
2-34 Springwood Apts	Demolition of recreation building in preparation of the reconstruction work.	\$70,000	\$0	0	Demolition included in building construction work commencing in August of 2006.
2-46 Cedarwood	New playground equipment.	\$15,000	\$10,403	\$10,403	COMPLETED
2-48 Juanita Trace	New playground equipment.	\$15,000	\$8,784	\$8,784	COMPLETED
2-12 Firwood Circle	Interior remodel, water lines, gas meters.	\$1,300,000	\$1,598	\$1,598	Construction contract executed August of 2005. Work underway.
2-17 Ballinger Homes	Community building remodel completion.	\$60,000	\$177,823	\$177,823	Completion of \$250,000 remodel of community building
	Totals	\$7,600,000	\$6,839,407	\$2,320,201	

SECTION VII: OWNED AND MANAGED UNITS

Under the MTW Demonstration, KCHA is continuing to explore new ways to improve the efficiency and cost-effectiveness of its operations. During FY 2005, the Authority continued to manage its public housing developments with a high level of efficiency and attention to quality of service as measured by the following indicators:

A. VACANCY RATES

KCHA's overall vacancy rate for FY 2005 was 1.2%, an amount that is not significantly different from the target of 1.01 established by the Authority as it entered the MTW demonstration program. The FY 2005 average is slightly lower (0.2%) than the amount (1.4%) posted during the previous fiscal year. Consistent with KCHA's MTW agreement, the Vacancy Rate is calculated as a snapshot of activity as of April 2005 and excludes units that were undergoing modernization or redevelopment (Park Lake Homes). The table below shows the actual vacancy rates for all public housing developments.

Development	Households	Units	Vacancy Rate
AVONDALE MANOR	20	20	0.0%
BALLINGER HOMES	110	110	0.0%
BELLEVUE SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES	8	8	0.0%
BOULEVARD MANOR	70	70	0.0%
BRIARWOOD	70	70	0.0%
BRITTANY PARK	43	43	0.0%
BURNDALE HOMES	49	50	2.0%
CAMPUS COURT	13	13	0.0%
CASA JUANITA	80	80	0.0%
CASA MADRONA	69	70	1.4%
CASCADE APTS	107	108	0.9%
CEDARWOOD	25	25	0.0%
COLLEGE PLACE	51	51	0.0%
EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	40	0.0%
EASTSIDE TERRACE	49	50	2.0%
EVERGREEN COURT	30	30	0.0%
FIRWOOD CIRCLE	50	50	0.0%
FOREST GLEN	39	40	2.5%
FOREST GROVE	25	25	0.0%
GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	10	0.0%
GREEN RIVER HOMES	57	60	5.0%
GREENLEAF	27	27	0.0%
GUSTAVES MANOR	35	35	0.0%
JUANITA COURT	30	30	0.0%
JUANITA TRACE	29	30	3.3%
JUANITA TRACE II	9	9	0.0%
KINGS COURT	30	30	0.0%
KIRKWOOD TERRACE	28	28	0.0%
MARDI GRAS	61	61	0.0%
MUNRO MANOR	60	60	0.0%

Development	Households	Units	Vacancy Rate
NORTHRIDGE HOUSE I	69	70	1.4%
NORTHRIDGE HOUSE II	70	70	0.0%
PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	70	0.0%
PARK LAKE HOMES	163	532	Redevelopment
PARK LAKE HOMES II	193	198	2.5%
PICKERING COURT	30	30	0.0
PLAZA 17	70	70	0.0%
RIVERTON TERRACE	59	60	1.7%
SHOREHAM	17	18	5.6%
SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	79	80	1.3%
SPRINGWOOD APTS	321	333	3.6%
THE LAKE HOUSE	69	70	1.4%
VALLI KEE HOMES	114	114	0.0%
VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDERAL WAY HOMES	17	18	5.6%
VISTA HEIGHTS	30	30	0.0%
WAYLAND ARMS	67	67	0.0%
WELLSWOOD	30	30	0.0%
YARDLEY ARMS	67	67	0.0%
YOUNGS LAKE	27	28	3.6%
UNITS IN DEVELOPMENTS NOT UNDER MODERNIZATION	2,723	2756	1.2%
ALL UNITS	2,886	3,288	12.2%

B. RENT COLLECTIONS

KCHA continued its successful record in collecting assessed rents in public housing. Consistent with its projections, the Authority collected more than 98 percent of rents during FY 2005. As noted in its prior year's MTW Report (FY 2004), the Authority's centralized rent collection (lock box payment) system has been proven an effective tool in the rent collection process and will continue to be utilized in the future in lieu of collecting rents directly on site.

C. WORK ORDERS

The Authority met its projected response rates to emergency maintenance work orders (more than 99%) as well as regular work orders (more than 97%) during FY 2005.

D. HQS INSPECTIONS

KCHA has delayed for future consideration any changes to its inspections protocols. Housing management staff conducted 100 percent of annual inspections during FY 2005. KCHA received a score of 94.46 percent under the most recently completed Public Housing inspections (FY 2002) by HUD contractors.

E. SECURITY

The Authority's primary strategies for ensuring resident safety and security continue to be thorough screening of applicants and proactive and consistent lease enforcement by housing management staff. The Authority has implemented and enforces strict One-strike screening policies for each of its Public Housing developments, including mandatory screening of applicant criminal history with the Washington State Patrol and the FBI's NCIC (National Criminal Information Clearinghouse) databank. KCHA also continues a range of programs to

prevent drug-related and other criminal activities, including strong partnerships with local police departments, the funding of community police officers in some developments, and after-school and summer programs for children.

As its new Site-based Management system is fully implemented, KCHA expects the on-site presence of assigned property managers and maintenance staff (discussed below) to lead to greater levels of security and safety for residents.

F. MTW INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY

KCHA engaged in a number of initiatives to improve its operations during FY 2005. Among these, a pilot program to implement asset management principles in the operations of public housing has been the most significant and most time consuming. Other efforts include policy changes such as changes to the Public Housing Waiting List and Preference system (discussed earlier in this Report) and changes to KCHA's Public Housing Rent policies.

G. SITE-BASED MANAGEMENT PILOT

Following successful implementation of a Site-based Management pilot program for a portion (approximately 20%) of its public housing units, KCHA accelerated its schedule for expansion of the program model to all of KCHA's public housing inventory. The purpose of this initiative is to improve operational efficiencies and customer service by adapting and adopting asset management practices characteristic of the private sector.

The Authority continued to monitor the implementation of the pilot during FY2005 while working to transition the operations of the entire portfolio of public housing to site-based management in FY 2006. Though program expansion will require major changes in KCHA operations, as well as intensive training of on-site staff, KCHA is confident that this and other efforts will lead to continued management excellence.

H. POLICY EFFORTS LEADING TO GREATER EFFICIENCY

Public Housing policy and program changes discussed in Section II of this Report were designed to improve operations. These include:

- ❑ **Site-Based Waiting Lists.** The adoption of site-based waiting lists for all of KCHA's public housing sites will to reduce Lease-up time for vacant units by allowing applicants a choice in the development in which they will live.
- ❑ **Public Housing Local Preferences.** Revision of KCHA's Local Preference system will significantly reduce the time needed to verify an applicant's claimed local preference, while reducing the incentive for applicants to provide inaccurate information in order receive a priority on KCHA's waiting list. The changes have also allowed KCHA to target priority populations more effectively.
- ❑ **Rent Policy Reform.** Though no final recommendations have been completed, the Housing Authority continued a collaborative effort between staff, residents and

community stakeholders to identify potential changes to the current rent calculation system that could lead to greater program efficiency while promoting resident self-sufficiency.

Other Streamlining Initiatives

A number of potential changes included in the FY 2005 MTW Plan were postponed for future consideration, delayed primarily to accommodate KCHA's decision to fully implement the Site-based Management demonstration ahead of schedule and to ensure adequate and careful review of complex issues in order to reduce likelihood that unintended adverse impacts could occur. The following proposed initiatives may still be pursued by KCHA during FY2006 or future years under the MTW demonstration program:

- ❑ Changes in eligibility of single, non-disabled, non-elderly persons. Any change in eligibility policy will be part of a more comprehensive review of admissions policies in FY2006.
- ❑ Transfers between Section 8 and public housing. The circumstances leading to a need for such transfers have not required a change in transfer policies.
- ❑ Inspection protocols. KCHA is continuing to review changes in inspection protocols, and may move forward with proposals in FY '06 that would improve efficiency without compromising quality and effectiveness.
- ❑ Exploring options to streamline grievance procedures.
- ❑ Replacing PHAS with internally developed performance tools and standards that effectively track the progress of the Agency's evolution to Site-based Management.
- ❑ Development of a Locally designed Lease consistent with MTW initiatives.

SECTION VIII: LEASED HOUSING

A. LEASE-UP RATES

During FY 2005 the funding structure for Section 8 shifted from a unit-based to a budget-based system where Housing Authorities are required to operate their programs within a specific dollar amount. As occurred throughout the country, King County Housing Authority received less funding than was needed to support their full allocation of authorized vouchers. Rather than fall short on payments to Section 8 property owners, KCHA implemented a number of cost saving measures, including restricting the reissuance of vouchers, thus lowering program lease up rates. For this reason, the lease up percentage dropped to 96.07%.

B. ENSURING RENT REASONABLENESS

KCHA ensures that the rents of all units subsidized under the Section 8 program are rent reasonable. To do this, trained Section 8 inspectors use a customized instrument produced by Dupre+Scott Apartment Advisors. The instrument is based on an extensive survey of over 75,000 housing units in KCHA's jurisdiction. It establishes the maximum rent for housing units based on location, size, quality, type, amenities, utilities, and general condition.

As was the case in FY 2004, inspectors continue to conduct rent reasonableness determinations for units owned by KCHA to eliminate delays in new lease-ups and to ensure timely completion of annual reviews. To streamline the process further, KCHA no longer conducts rent reasonableness determinations at annual recertifications when contract rents do not increase unless there has been a documented shift in the local rental market. These and other efforts to streamline the program will continue to ensure that all contract rents approved by the Authority do not exceed their market value.

C. EXPANDING HOUSING OPPORTUNITIES AND DECONCENTRATION

KCHA continues to pursue every avenue to expand housing opportunities through the Section 8 Program. In doing so, the Authority is implementing strategies that increase the availability of housing in areas with low levels of poverty and good schools and employment opportunities. These efforts include:

- ❑ Continuing to apply for qualifying voucher funding made available by HUD such as the Mainstream Vouchers for elderly households or individuals with disabilities as well as additional relocation vouchers to ensure replacement of households demolished through the HOPE VI project at Park Lake.
- ❑ The Housing Access and Services Program (HASP), created to coordinate housing and services to disabled households through the use of Allocation and Mainstream Vouchers, continues to provide critical housing and support services to disabled households in King County. To further ensure access to this program, disabled households living in group settings are now able to access state funds if the units they lease have rents that exceed the applicable payment standard.
- ❑ KCHA continues to research and acquire properties throughout King County to ensure that existing affordable housing stock is preserved over the long term.
- ❑ Section 8 households continue to take advantage of exception rent payment standards in sub-markets where rents are significantly above the average rents in King County.

- ❑ An expanded Section 8 Project-Basing Program, discussed in more detail below, has increased the availability of housing in low-poverty areas.
- ❑ Successful outreach to landlords through a variety of avenues including trade shows and onsite trainings has resulted in the participation of over 3,200 landlords in the Section 8 Program. A growing number of landlords are listing available units through internet tools developed by KCHA and available to voucher holders.

D. OTHER MTW DEMONSTRATION INITIATIVES

Project-Based Assistance Program

KCHA continues to implement its Project-Based Assistance Program. The Authority's Board adopted a local policy in FY 2003, and implementation commenced in FY 2004. Staff is nearing completion of a comprehensive implementation manual and has completed an extensive revision of the Housing Assistance Payments (HAP) Contract for existing housing in order to facilitate private sector investment in affordable housing. KCHA has entered into HAP Contracts with housing and service providers on a number of high-priority projects. These projects include:

- ❑ **HOPE VI Replacement Housing.** In order to maintain the number of housing units affordable to families with extremely low incomes in King County after demolition of public housing units in KCHA's HOPE VI site, KCHA is using Project-Based Assistance to subsidize market-rate housing in scattered sites. Furthering the HOPE VI goal of deconcentration, these units are primarily located in high-employment areas of the county with strong school systems. In addition to the 89 units contracted in FY2004, KCHA signed agreements and contracts for an additional 15 units of replacement housing FY2005. To date, 90 replacement housing units are leased to eligible families who are now receiving Project Based Assistance.

Setting up the waiting lists for these units was a large focus of the Project-Based Assistance program in FY 2004. Applicants have been able apply for these units at any of KCHA's Public Housing offices. A Section 8 staff person dedicated to the Project-Based Assistance Program works closely with the property manager to refer applicants from the waiting list when units become available and to coordinate the screening of these applicants.

- ❑ **Transitional Housing: Sound Families Program.** Through the end of FY 2005 KCHA has signed contracts with housing and service providers to create 105 additional units of supportive housing under the Sound Families Program, a partnership between local housing authorities and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to address the plight of homeless women and children in the Puget Sound region. The project-based rental assistance in these projects has leveraged \$2.1 million in capital and service funding from the Foundation.

Block Grant Program and Policy Initiatives

KCHA continued its efforts to improve the self-sufficiency outcomes of Section 8 participants by expanding funding under the Block Grant. TANF participation by KCHA's public housing households continued to drop in FY 2005.

Shared Housing for Disabled Households

An initiative proposed in FY 2004 and adopted in FY 2005 resulted in a new income disregard for individuals with a disability living in shared housing settings where they receive on-site case management and support services. Because larger, single-family dwellings typically have higher rents, the State of Washington provides a subsidy for the difference between the contract rent and the payment standard in order to ensure that participants pay no more than 30 percent of their income towards their housing costs. This subsidy is not included in annual income for the purpose of calculating rent contributions.

Streamlining and Cost Containment Initiatives

Due to a significant reduction in funding of the Section 8 Program by HUD in January 2005, the Authority vigorously pursued a number of efforts to immediately cut costs and improve the efficiency of the program. These efforts, as well as other streamlining initiatives under review, which will be implemented in FY 2006 are listed below:

- ❑ Developed a new moving procedure where participants must give the Housing Authority proper notice of their intent to move by the 20th of each month in order to have their move processed in that month. Notice given after the 20th will delay a participant's move until the following month.
- ❑ Required participants moving to a new unit in the middle of a month to be responsible for the full amount of rent in their new unit until the subsidy in the unit they are moving from expires.
- ❑ Revised the Rent Reasonableness procedure to only require a comparability study to be performed where a landlord has requested an increase in rent or if the Housing Authority determines there has been a significant decrease in the market.
- ❑ Revised the verification process for childcare payments to allow for participants to self-certify any claimed payment of less than \$50. Normally payments of this small amount also involve an additional subsidy paid to the provider by DSHS and result in very little change in the tenant's rental portion.
- ❑ As part of the immediate cost cutting changes required due to the budget shortfall, KCHA implemented the following:
 - The payment standard was reduced. However, in order to see more immediate savings, the Housing Authority revised its policy to implement the reduction at the participants next annual review rather than waiting to the second annual review following the change as required by current federal regulations.
 - Rent levels were frozen for one year for all units.
 - The rental cap for participants at initial housing was increased from 40% of their adjusted monthly income to 40% of their gross monthly income. This allowed for additional housing opportunities without being unduly restrictive.
 - Subsidy occupancy standards were altered to require one bedroom per every two adults.

- The Housing Authority Board of Commissioners approved a rental surcharge of \$20 for families and \$10 for elderly and disabled to be implemented in further cost-cutting was necessary. To date, this change has not been implemented.

E. INSPECTION STRATEGY

During FY 2005, the Housing Authority assessed potential changes to its inspection protocol to improve productivity and efficiency through possible:

- ❑ Reduction in annual inspections through sampling;
- ❑ Reduction in annual inspections based on populations (i.e., elderly and disabled); and
- ❑ Elimination of missed inspections through a reward system.

Unfortunately, as each option was researched, it became evident KCHA would not be able to ensure the quality of units and therefore, did not feel comfortable implementing the proposals. In lieu of a viable alternative, KCHA inspectors continued to perform 100 percent of annual HQS, pre-contract inspections, annual inspections and quality control inspections using the previously adopted changes, including:

- ❑ KCHA staff performs HQS inspections of Authority-owned units.
- ❑ Self-certification by owners and tenants of correction of minor fail items identified during annual inspections.
- ❑ A redefinition of “annual inspections” which allowed inspections to be completed by the annual review date rather than within 12 months of the last inspection.

However, KCHA continues to believe that further streamlining of the HQS inspections process is possible, perhaps through a system that would decouple the process from the participants Annual Review date. As a result, KCHA will continue to include an examination and review of HQS Inspection Strategies in its MTW work plan during FY 2006.

SECTION IX: RESIDENT PROGRAMS

KCHA operates a broad spectrum of resident support programs through its Resident Services Department utilizing both direct service staff and established partnerships with community-based service providers. These programs focus on three major goals:

- ❑ To support early childhood learning and development opportunities and youth recreation and after school activities;
- ❑ To provide residents with a broad array of employment training and economic self-sufficiency-related programs; and
- ❑ To support senior and younger disabled residents with services that build community and will enable the residents to remain healthy and independent for as long as possible.

The on-going reductions in HUD-funding for support services represents a formidable challenge for KCHA to ensure access to needed programs that complement its housing services. Despite the loss of federal funding, such as the Drug Elimination Grant and ROSS Programs, which provided funding for self-sufficiency programs, the Authority has worked hard to maintain an adequate level of services in its developments.

The following is a discussion of key initiatives taken during KCHA's FY 2005 year in support of public housing residents and Section 8 participants. A complete listing of resident service programs and services was included in Appendix G of the MTW FY 2005 Annual Plan.

A. SUPPORT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD LEARNING AND YOUTH RECREATION

In FY2005, KCHA completed the new Kent Family Center, a 14,000 square foot facility at Springwood Apartments. This building contains four state-of-the-art Head Start classrooms, indoor and outdoor play areas and an arts and crafts room. The facility serves 158 Head Start students daily and provides support services to families by co-locating a primary Health Clinic and a Career Development Center on the second floor. Also during this year, KCHA completed re-development of the Head Start facility located at Park Lake II and continued to work with Puget Sound Educational Service District in its development of future Head Start site at Greenbridge that will service King County's poorest community.

KCHA continues to work with Boys and Girls Clubs and other community based service providers to ensure on-site, after school recreation and educational support activities for youth are provided at our larger public housing sites.

B. SELF-SUFFICIENCY SERVICES AND PROGRAMS

In FY 2005, KCHA continued to develop and expand its diverse set of programs designed to increase the economic self-sufficiency of residents. Specifically:

- ❑ **Career Development Centers (CDCs).** Two Career Development Centers continue to operate in the Authority's two largest family developments: Park Lake Homes (to be renamed Greenbridge upon redevelopment) and Springwood Apartments on the East Hill of Kent. These two centers focus on job skill training, job placement, and other services to public housing and Section 8 residents. In FY 2005, the Springwood CDC moved into its new on-site location, the Kent Family Center where it can coordinate its services with other family support activities. KCHA continues to contract with the Center for Career Alternatives at Springwood and the YWCA at the Park Lake Homes CDC. In FY 2005, the Authority adjusted to the loss of ROSS Grant support by providing direct public housing funding for the operation of the Springwood CDC.
- ❑ **Community College Partnerships.** In the third and final year of its ROSS Grant funding, the Authority continues to partner with three community colleges in the north and east areas of the county. Three full-time staff work with residents to enroll them in appropriate community college programs to promote attainment of higher wage jobs and other income progression objectives. ROSS Grant funding for this program expired at the end of our FY 2005 but KCHA has provided bridge funds to allow continuation of this successful program, at a reduced level of activity, while additional funds are sought.
- ❑ **Homeownership.** KCHA expanded its homeownership program through a new Section 8 Homeownership Program funded through a HUD ROSS grant for public housing residents. The program offers down payment assistance from KCHA's MTW block grant and other pre-purchase and post-purchase incentives to assist residents in buying homes. Residents of Young's Lake—the site of KCHA's successful and award winning time-limited homeownership pilot program—continue to have access to homeownership education and counseling under the new program, which also serves nine other KCHA family sites. During this reporting year, over 1,000 direct solicitations took place through mailings and door-to-door flyers. Over 100 individuals have attended homeownership workshops and credit/budgeting seminars sponsored by our contracted providers (Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle, El Centro de la Raza, and International District Housing Alliance). Within this fiscal year, thirteen applications have been processed, resulting in 35 families purchasing homes.

FY2005 Self-Sufficiency Outcomes

Family households living in public housing (residents who lived in public housing in 2003 and 2004) continue to make strides towards economic self-sufficiency. In 2005:

- ❑ **Employment Rates.** Over half of all public housing households have at least one member with earned income.
- ❑ **Transition from Welfare to Work.** Less than 27 percent of the families relied on TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) as a source of income.

Household incomes of Public Housing residents rose an average 6.4 percent in 2005. Although Section 8 family households' economic outcomes are improving, they lag significantly behind public housing families when these measures are considered. The differences may be attributable to the on-site self-sufficiency services available in public housing and the earned income disregards that are part of the rent policy in public housing.

Efforts to Strengthen Self-Sufficiency Outcomes

An evaluation of KCHA's self-sufficiency programs was completed. Based on the evaluation and recommendations by a consultant provided by the Annie E. Casey Foundation, KCHA will be launching an integrated self-sufficiency pilot in the Kent area in the spring of 2006 that will serve Section 8 and public housing families, with the goal of replicating this model in other KCHA sites. Our existing Section 8 Family Self-Sufficiency Program will be integrated into this effort. This pilot will coordinate engagement and recruitment activities; life skills and literacy instruction; training and education; job placement, job retention, and wage progression; asset building; family support; and case management services. Resident Services will monitor and evaluate these efforts to determine how successful this pilot is in increasing employment rates, job retention, transition from Welfare to Work, asset building, income progression, and transition into homeownership or market rate rentals. Feedback from resident customers, service providers, and KCHA staff will be a part of this evaluation process

C. ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF SENIOR AND YOUNGER DISABLED POPULATIONS

In FY 2005, the Authority continued its commitment to serve both elderly and younger disabled households. KCHA support service coordination staff is assigned to every development, ensuring that resident support services needs are identified and addressed as early as possible. In October 2004 the Authority received authority to extend its Designated Housing Plan for an additional two-years. We have put in place a mechanism to track residency in our high-rise buildings to ensure each building has a best mix of senior and younger disabled residents. The designation plan for our mixed-population developments:

- ❑ Commits KCHA to provide access to all developments for both elderly and younger households.
- ❑ Recognizes that individuals' disabilities are not the underlying cause of problems in buildings.
- ❑ Identifies differences in lifestyle and expectations between elderly and very young households as a source of friction in the buildings: the larger the percentage of very young residents, the greater the potential of conflict in buildings.
- ❑ Sets aside 78% of units in every building for occupation by individuals and households over 55 years of age—at the time of policy adoption, 87% of units overall were occupied by "near elderly" and elderly residents.

KCHA monitors the population mix for every vacancy that occurs. Appendix S is a sample of the report that tracks the population mix for property management staff.

D. REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS

KCHA employs a Section 504 Coordinator who responds to Public Housing, Preservation and Section 8 program reasonable accommodation requests as well as those of applicants to the housing programs. The Coordinator actively engages residents, KCHA staff, applicants, and medical providers in the decision-making process. During FY 2005, the Coordinator has:

- ❑ Received and processed 822 reasonable accommodation/unit modification requests. Of these, 320 were from existing public housing residents, 215 were from resident applicants to public housing and 287 requests were from the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher program.
- ❑ Revised procedures for processing requests under an increasingly decentralized decision-making and management model. During this fiscal year, the 504 Coordinator revised KCHA's internal process to further process requests in a timely manner.
- ❑ Worked with the Public Housing Site Based Management staff to provide training and coordination of reasonable accommodation requests as the Authority moves from five regional offices to site based management.

E. SUPPORTIVE HOUSING THROUGH KCHA'S SECTION 8 PROJECT-BASED ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

One of the primary purposes of the project-based assistance program is to create housing opportunities for individuals and families who need intensive on-site services. Much of the housing project-based during FY2005 provided supportive housing opportunities for households with disabilities or for families with children through either the HASP or Sound Families Programs. In all of these cases, appropriate support services are available.

Appendices to KCHA's FY2005 MTW Report

Appendix A: 2005 Family Public Housing Demographics

2005			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
North	BALLINGER HOMES	108	12	23	73	53	15	1	37	2	10	39	39	14	6	85	17	5	1
	GREEN LEAF	27	6	6	15	17	6	0	4	0	0	22	5	0	0	21	5	0	1
	Subtotal	135	18	29	88	70	21	1	41	2	10	61	44	14	6	106	22	5	2
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	3	0	17	13	2	0	2	3	0	4	10	6	0	16	2	2	0
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0	0	8	6	1	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	0	6	2	0	0
	CEDARWOOD	25	6	3	16	16	2	0	6	1	0	22	3	0	0	20	5	0	0
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	9	10	32	26	6	0	19	0	0	37	14	0	0	40	11	0	0
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	49	7	14	28	26	9	0	13	1	8	31	10	0	0	37	7	4	1
	FOREST GROVE	25	5	3	17	16	0	0	7	2	0	18	7	0	0	19	3	1	2
	JUANITA COURT	30	4	6	20	18	1	0	9	2	0	25	5	0	0	24	3	3	0
	JUANITA TRACE	29	5	6	18	18	1	1	8	1	0	24	5	0	0	20	6	2	1
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	3	0	6	4	3	0	2	0	0	4	5	0	0	7	1	1	0
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	26	4	4	18	14	5	0	4	3	0	22	4	0	0	20	5	1	0
	WELLSSWOOD	30	11	6	13	24	1	0	3	2	0	25	5	0	0	24	3	3	0
	Subtotal	302	57	52	193	181	31	1	74	15	8	212	76	6	0	233	48	17	4
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	13	2	1	10	3	6	0	4	0	0	0	13	0	0	11	2	0	0
	PARK LAKE HOME SITE I	192	47	53	92	50	33	2	104	3	12	131	47	2	0	159	26	6	1
	PARK LAKE HOMES SITE II	160	38	43	79	34	40	2	82	2	44	36	64	16	0	139	18	3	0
	RIVERTON TERRACE	29	9	6	14	5	13	0	11	0	0	18	5	4	2	24	4	1	0
	SHOREHAM APTS	17	5	0	12	4	7	0	6	0	0	0	17	0	0	16	1	0	0
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	17	1	3	13	5	7	0	5	0	0	0	17	0	0	13	3	1	0
	Subtotal	428	102	106	220	101	106	4	212	5	56	185	163	22	2	362	54	11	1
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	107	16	19	72	72	20	0	11	4	8	52	47	0	0	96	10	1	0
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	2	3	5	6	2	0	2	0	0	6	4	0	0	6	4	0	0
	SPRINGWOOD	316	20	34	262	174	97	3	34	8	0	121	152	43	0	282	30	3	1
	VALLI KEE	114	34	17	63	64	39	3	5	3	18	26	50	20	0	101	11	2	0
	VISTA HEIGHTS	30	4	4	22	18	10	1	0	1	0	0	30	0	0	21	8	1	0
	YOUNG'S LAKE	27	0	5	22	25	1	0	1	0	0	4	23	0	0	16	9	2	0
Subtotal	604	76	82	446	359	169	7	53	16	26	209	306	63	0	522	72	9	1	
South	BURNDALE HOMES	49	6	7	36	40	1	0	8	0	3	16	21	6	3	34	12	2	1
	EVERGREEN COURT	29	8	4	17	18	5	0	4	2	0	21	8	0	0	25	2	1	1
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	50	6	8	36	40	6	0	3	1	4	16	20	8	2	45	4	1	0
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	57	17	16	24	39	9	0	8	1	8	29	17	3	0	47	10	0	0
	KING'S COURT	30	4	8	18	20	2	0	8	0	0	21	9	0	0	26	4	0	0
	PICKERING COURT	30	3	4	23	21	3	1	1	4	4	17	9	0	0	20	9	1	0
Subtotal	245	44	47	154	178	26	1	32	8	19	120	84	17	5	197	41	5	2	
Grand Total: All Family Developments		1,714	297	316	1,101	889	353	14	412	46	119	787	673	122	13	1,420	237	47	10

2005			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
North	BALLINGER HOMES	108	11%	21%	68%	49%	14%	1%	34%	2%	9%	36%	36%	13%	6%	79%	16%	5%	1%
	GREEN LEAF	27	22%	22%	56%	63%	22%	0%	15%	0%	0%	81%	19%	0%	0%	78%	19%	0%	4%
	Subtotal	135	13%	21%	65%	52%	16%	1%	30%	1%	7%	45%	33%	10%	4%	79%	16%	4%	1%
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	15%	0%	85%	65%	10%	0%	10%	15%	0%	20%	50%	30%	0%	80%	10%	10%	0%
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0%	0%	100%	75%	13%	0%	13%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%
	CEDARWOOD	25	24%	12%	64%	64%	8%	0%	24%	4%	0%	88%	12%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	18%	20%	63%	51%	12%	0%	37%	0%	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	78%	22%	0%	0%
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	49	14%	29%	57%	53%	18%	0%	27%	2%	16%	63%	20%	0%	0%	76%	14%	8%	2%
	FOREST GROVE	25	20%	12%	68%	64%	0%	0%	28%	8%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	76%	12%	4%	8%
	JUANITA COURT	30	13%	20%	67%	60%	3%	0%	30%	7%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	80%	10%	10%	0%
	JUANITA TRACE	29	17%	21%	62%	62%	3%	3%	28%	3%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	69%	21%	7%	3%
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	33%	0%	67%	44%	33%	0%	22%	0%	0%	44%	56%	0%	0%	78%	11%	11%	0%
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	26	15%	15%	69%	54%	19%	0%	15%	12%	0%	85%	15%	0%	0%	77%	19%	4%	0%
	WELLSSWOOD	30	37%	20%	43%	80%	3%	0%	10%	7%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	80%	10%	10%	0%
		Subtotal	302	19%	17%	64%	60%	10%	0%	25%	5%	3%	70%	25%	2%	0%	77%	16%	6%
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	13	15%	8%	77%	23%	46%	0%	31%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	85%	15%	0%	0%
	PARK LAKE HOMES I	192	24%	28%	48%	26%	17%	1%	54%	2%	6%	68%	24%	1%	0%	83%	14%	3%	1%
	PARK LAKE HOMES II	160	24%	27%	49%	21%	25%	1%	51%	1%	28%	23%	40%	10%	0%	87%	11%	2%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE	29	31%	21%	48%	17%	45%	0%	38%	0%	0%	62%	17%	14%	7%	83%	14%	3%	0%
	SHOREHAM APTS	17	29%	0%	71%	24%	41%	0%	35%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	94%	6%	0%	0%
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	17	6%	18%	76%	29%	41%	0%	29%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	76%	18%	6%	0%
	Subtotal	428	24%	25%	51%	24%	25%	1%	50%	1%	13%	43%	38%	5%	0%	85%	13%	3%	0%
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	107	15%	18%	67%	67%	19%	0%	10%	4%	7%	49%	44%	0%	0%	90%	9%	1%	0%
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	20%	30%	50%	60%	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%
	SPRINGWOOD	316	6%	11%	83%	55%	31%	1%	11%	3%	0%	38%	48%	14%	0%	89%	9%	1%	0%
	VALLI KEE	114	30%	15%	55%	56%	34%	3%	4%	3%	16%	23%	44%	18%	0%	89%	10%	2%	0%
	VISTA HEIGHTS	30	13%	13%	73%	60%	33%	3%	0%	3%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	70%	27%	3%	0%
	YOUNG'S LAKE	27	0%	19%	81%	93%	4%	0%	4%	0%	0%	15%	85%	0%	0%	59%	33%	7%	0%
	Subtotal	604	13%	14%	74%	59%	28%	1%	9%	3%	4%	35%	51%	10%	0%	86%	12%	1%	0%
South	BURNDALE HOMES	49	12%	14%	73%	82%	2%	0%	16%	0%	6%	33%	43%	12%	6%	69%	24%	4%	2%
	EVERGREEN COURT	29	28%	14%	59%	62%	17%	0%	14%	7%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	86%	7%	3%	3%
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	50	12%	16%	72%	80%	12%	0%	6%	2%	8%	32%	40%	16%	4%	90%	8%	2%	0%
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	57	30%	28%	42%	68%	16%	0%	14%	2%	14%	51%	30%	5%	0%	82%	18%	0%	0%
	KING'S COURT	30	13%	27%	60%	67%	7%	0%	27%	0%	0%	70%	30%	0%	0%	87%	13%	0%	0%
	PICKERING COURT	30	10%	13%	77%	70%	10%	3%	3%	13%	13%	57%	30%	0%	0%	67%	30%	3%	0%
	Subtotal	245	18%	19%	63%	73%	11%	0%	13%	3%	8%	49%	34%	7%	2%	80%	17%	2%	1%
Grand Total: All Family Developments		1,714	17%	18%	64%	52%	21%	1%	24%	3%	7%	46%	39%	7%	1%	83%	14%	3%	1%

Appendix B: 2004 Family Public Housing Demographics

2004			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)				
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	
North	BALLINGER HOMES	110	13	33	64	57	16		1	34	2	10	40	40	14	6	89	17	3	1
	GREEN LEAF	27	6	8	13	16	6		0	5	0	0	22	5	0	0	22	4	0	1
	Subtotal	137	19	41	77	73	22	1	39	2	10	62	45	14	6	111	21	3	2	
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	3	1	16	13	2		0	2	3	0	4	10	6	0	16	4	0	0
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0	1	7	5	1		0	1	1	0	0	8	0	0	5	3	0	0
	CEDARWOOD	25	6	4	15	16	2		0	6	1	0	22	3	0	0	21	4	0	0
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	7	12	32	27	6		0	18	0	0	37	14	0	0	38	11	2	0
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	49	5	17	27	26	8		0	14	1	7	32	10	0	0	38	8	2	1
	FOREST GROVE	25	2	6	17	16	0		0	7	2	0	18	7	0	0	18	3	3	1
	JUANITA COURT	30	4	6	20	16	1		0	10	3	0	25	5	0	0	25	3	0	2
	JUANITA TRACE	30	5	8	17	20	1		1	7	1	0	25	5	0	0	23	3	3	1
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	4	0	5	5	1		0	3	0	0	4	5	0	0	6	1	2	0
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	28	4	5	19	15	4		0	6	3	0	22	6	0	0	23	5	0	0
	WELLSWOOD	30	11	7	12	24	1		0	3	2	0	25	5	0	0	23	5	2	0
	Subtotal	305	51	67	187	183	27	1	77	17	7	214	78	6	0	236	50	14	5	
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	13	0	3	10	3	6		0	4	0	0	0	13	0	0	13	0	0	0
	PARK LAKE HOME SITE I	249	65	78	106	67	50	4	123	5	19	160	65	5	0	209	35	3	1	
	PARK LAKE HOMES SITE II	161	26	58	77	34	39	1	86	1	44	36	65	16	0	140	16	4	0	
	RIVERTON TERRACE	28	8	8	12	5	12		0	11	0	0	17	5	4	2	24	4	1	0
	SHOREHAM APTS	18	3	2	13	5	6		0	7	0	0	0	18	0	0	15	2	1	0
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	18	2	2	14	6	7		0	5	0	0	0	18	0	0	15	3	0	0
	Subtotal	487	104	151	232	120	120	5	236	6	63	213	184	25	2	416	60	9	1	
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	107	18	22	67	72	19	1	11	4	8	52	47	0	0	98	8	1	0	
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	2	4	4	6	2		0	2	0	0	6	4	0	0	7	3	0	0
	SPRINGWOOD	310	21	49	240	181	94	2	28	5	0	114	152	44	0	279	28	1	1	
	VALLI KEE	114	25	27	62	63	38	3	7	3	18	26	50	20	0	101	11	1	1	
	VISTA HEIGHTS	30	5	7	18	18	9	1	1	1	0	0	30	0	0	21	9	0	0	
	YOUNG'S LAKE	27	1	5	21	25	1		0	1	0	0	4	23	0	0	17	8	2	0
	Subtotal	598	72	114	412	365	163	7	50	13	26	202	306	64	0	523	67	5	2	
South	BURNDALÉ HOMES	41	4	7	30	34	1		0	6	0	2	15	15	6	3	29	10	1	1
	EVERGREEN COURT	30	6	8	16	21	4		0	4	1	0	22	8	0	0	26	1	1	2
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	49	5	10	34	41	3		0	3	2	4	16	20	7	2	40	7	1	1
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	57	16	18	23	40	10		0	6	1	8	28	17	4	0	44	13	0	0
	KING'S COURT	30	4	8	18	20	2		0	8	0	0	21	9	0	0	26	4	0	0
	PICKERING COURT	21	4	4	13	17	1		0	1	2	3	12	6	0	0	14	5	2	0
Subtotal	228	39	55	134	173	21	0	28	6	17	114	75	17	5	179	40	5	4		
Grand Total: All Family Developments		1,755	285	428	1,042	914	353	14	430	44	123	805	688	126	13	1,465	238	36	14	

2004			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
North	BALLINGER HOMES	110	12%	30%	58%	52%	15%	1%	31%	2%	9%	36%	36%	13%	5%	81%	15%	3%	1%
	GREEN LEAF	27	22%	30%	48%	59%	22%	0%	19%	0%	0%	81%	19%	0%	0%	81%	15%	0%	4%
	Subtotal	137	14%	30%	56%	53%	16%	1%	28%	1%	7%	45%	33%	10%	4%	81%	15%	2%	1%
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	15%	5%	80%	65%	10%	0%	10%	15%	0%	20%	50%	30%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0%	13%	88%	63%	13%	0%	13%	13%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	63%	38%	0%	0%
	CEDARWOOD	25	24%	16%	60%	64%	8%	0%	24%	4%	0%	88%	12%	0%	0%	84%	16%	0%	0%
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	14%	24%	63%	53%	12%	0%	35%	0%	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	75%	22%	4%	0%
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	49	10%	35%	55%	53%	16%	0%	29%	2%	14%	65%	20%	0%	0%	78%	16%	4%	2%
	FOREST GROVE	25	8%	24%	68%	64%	0%	0%	28%	8%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	72%	12%	12%	4%
	JUANITA COURT	30	13%	20%	67%	53%	3%	0%	33%	10%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	83%	10%	0%	7%
	JUANITA TRACE	30	17%	27%	57%	67%	3%	3%	23%	3%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	77%	10%	10%	3%
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	44%	0%	56%	56%	11%	0%	33%	0%	0%	44%	56%	0%	0%	67%	11%	22%	0%
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	28	14%	18%	68%	54%	14%	0%	21%	11%	0%	79%	21%	0%	0%	82%	18%	0%	0%
	WELLSWOOD	30	37%	23%	40%	80%	3%	0%	10%	7%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	77%	17%	7%	0%
	Subtotal	305	17%	22%	61%	60%	9%	0%	25%	6%	2%	70%	26%	2%	0%	77%	16%	5%	2%
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	13	0%	23%	77%	23%	46%	0%	31%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	PARK LAKE HOMES I	249	26%	31%	43%	27%	20%	2%	49%	2%	8%	64%	26%	2%	0%	84%	14%	1%	0%
	PARK LAKE HOMES II	161	16%	36%	48%	21%	24%	1%	53%	1%	27%	22%	40%	10%	0%	87%	10%	2%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE	28	29%	29%	43%	18%	43%	0%	39%	0%	0%	61%	18%	14%	7%	86%	14%	4%	0%
	SHOREHAM APTS	18	17%	11%	72%	28%	33%	0%	39%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	83%	11%	6%	0%
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	18	11%	11%	78%	33%	39%	0%	28%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	487	21%	31%	48%	25%	25%	1%	48%	1%	13%	44%	38%	5%	0%	85%	12%	2%	0%
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	107	17%	21%	63%	67%	18%	1%	10%	4%	7%	49%	44%	0%	0%	92%	7%	1%	0%
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	20%	40%	40%	60%	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	70%	30%	0%	0%
	SPRINGWOOD	310	7%	16%	77%	58%	30%	1%	9%	2%	0%	37%	49%	14%	0%	90%	9%	0%	0%
	VALLI KEE	114	22%	24%	54%	55%	33%	3%	6%	3%	16%	23%	44%	18%	0%	89%	10%	1%	1%
	VISTA HEIGHTS	30	17%	23%	60%	60%	30%	3%	3%	3%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	70%	30%	0%	0%
	YOUNG'S LAKE	27	4%	19%	78%	93%	4%	0%	4%	0%	0%	15%	85%	0%	0%	63%	30%	7%	0%
	Subtotal	598	12%	19%	69%	61%	27%	1%	8%	2%	4%	34%	51%	11%	0%	87%	11%	1%	0%
South	BURNDALE HOMES	41	10%	17%	73%	83%	2%	0%	15%	0%	5%	37%	37%	15%	7%	71%	24%	2%	2%
	EVERGREEN COURT	30	20%	27%	53%	70%	13%	0%	13%	3%	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	87%	3%	3%	7%
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	49	10%	20%	69%	84%	6%	0%	6%	4%	8%	33%	41%	14%	4%	82%	14%	2%	2%
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	57	28%	32%	40%	70%	18%	0%	11%	2%	14%	49%	30%	7%	0%	77%	23%	0%	0%
	KING'S COURT	30	13%	27%	60%	67%	7%	0%	27%	0%	0%	70%	30%	0%	0%	87%	13%	0%	0%
	PICKERING COURT	21	19%	19%	62%	81%	5%	0%	5%	10%	14%	57%	29%	0%	0%	67%	24%	10%	0%
	Subtotal	228	17%	24%	59%	76%	9%	0%	12%	3%	7%	50%	33%	7%	2%	79%	18%	2%	2%
Grand Total: All Family Developments		1,755	16%	24%	59%	52%	20%	1%	25%	3%	7%	46%	39%	7%	1%	83%	14%	2%	1%

Appendix C: 2003 Family Public Housing Demographics

2003			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
North	BALLINGER HOMES	110	17	21	72	60	12	1	35	2	10	40	40	14	6	85	18	4	3
	GREEN LEAF	27	9	3	15	16	6	0	5	0	0	22	5	0	0	22	4	0	1
	Subtotal	137	26	24	87	76	18	1	40	2	10	62	45	14	6	107	22	4	4
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	1	1	18	12	2	0	3	3	0	4	10	6	0	17	3	0	0
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0	1	7	4	1	0	2	1	0	0	8	0	0	6	2	0	0
	CEDARWOOD	25	4	2	19	16	1	0	6	2	0	18	7	0	0	17	4	2	2
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	8	8	35	30	2	0	18	1	0	37	14	0	0	41	8	2	0
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	50	7	15	28	28	6	0	15	1	8	32	10	0	0	40	7	2	1
	FOREST GROVE	25	6	4	15	16	1	0	7	1	0	22	3	0	0	19	5	1	0
	JUANITA COURT	30	7	7	16	16	2	0	10	2	0	25	5	0	0	23	4	2	1
	JUANITA TRACE	30	4	4	22	20	1	0	7	2	0	25	5	0	0	18	8	3	1
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	3	0	6	6	1	0	2	0	0	4	5	0	0	7	2	0	0
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	27	5	3	19	17	5	0	5	0	0	21	6	0	0	22	4	1	0
	WELLSWOOD	30	10	5	15	23	2	0	2	3	0	25	5	0	0	23	6	0	1
	Subtotal	305	55	50	200	188	24	0	77	16	8	213	78	6	0	233	53	13	6
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	12	0	2	10	3	6	0	3	0	0	0	12	0	0	11	1	0	0
	PARK LAKE HOME SITE I	557	132	108	317	128	134	8	280	7	53	343	146	15	0	492	58	6	1
	PARK LAKE HOMES SITE II	163	42	40	81	38	36	1	86	2	44	36	67	16	0	143	17	3	0
	RIVERTON TERRACE	30	10	5	15	5	13	0	12	0	0	18	5	5	2	26	4	0	0
	SHOREHAM APTS	18	2	1	15	5	6	0	7	0	0	0	18	0	0	17	1	0	0
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	15	0	2	13	4	5	0	5	1	0	0	15	0	0	14	1	0	0
	Subtotal	795	186	158	451	183	200	9	393	10	97	397	263	36	2	703	82	9	1
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	108	15	11	82	77	20	1	7	3	8	52	48	0	0	93	11	3	1
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	2	1	7	6	2	0	2	0	0	6	4	0	0	8	2	0	0
	SPRINGWOOD	327	29	35	263	200	92	5	27	3	0	119	159	49	0	309	16	2	0
	VALLI KEE	114	29	19	66	67	32	2	12	1	18	26	50	20	0	99	11	2	2
	VISTA HEIGHTS	31	6	3	22	19	9	0	2	1	0	0	31	0	0	20	11	0	0
	YOUNG'S LAKE	26	3	2	21	24	1	0	1	0	0	4	22	0	0	18	5	2	1
	Subtotal	616	84	71	461	393	156	8	51	8	26	207	314	69	0	547	56	9	4
South	BURNDAL HOMES	49	3	11	35	39	1	0	9	0	3	16	21	6	3	41	6	2	0
	EVERGREEN COURT	30	6	4	20	21	4	0	4	1	0	22	8	0	0	24	5	1	0
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	49	6	6	37	40	4	0	4	1	4	16	19	8	2	38	7	4	0
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	59	15	12	32	43	7	0	8	1	8	30	17	4	0	52	6	1	0
	KING'S COURT	30	6	6	18	20	1	0	9	0	0	21	9	0	0	27	3	0	0
	PICKERING COURT	30	5	3	22	23	3	1	1	2	4	17	9	0	0	23	5	2	0
	Subtotal	247	41	42	164	186	20	1	35	5	19	122	83	18	5	205	32	10	0
Grand Total: All Family Developments		2,100	392	345	1,363	1,026	418	19	596	41	160	1,001	783	143	13	1,795	245	45	15

2003			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)					Income Group (As % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	1	2	3	4	5	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
North	BALLINGER HOMES	110	15%	19%	65%	55%	11%	1%	32%	2%	9%	36%	36%	13%	5%	77%	16%	4%	3%
	GREEN LEAF	27	33%	11%	56%	59%	22%	0%	19%	0%	0%	81%	19%	0%	0%	81%	15%	0%	4%
	Subtotal	137	19%	18%	64%	55%	13%	1%	29%	1%	7%	45%	33%	10%	4%	78%	16%	3%	3%
East	AVONDALE MANOR	20	5%	5%	90%	60%	10%	0%	15%	15%	0%	20%	50%	30%	0%	85%	15%	0%	0%
	BELLEVUE 8	8	0%	13%	88%	50%	13%	0%	25%	13%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%
	CEDARWOOD	26	16%	8%	76%	64%	4%	0%	24%	8%	0%	72%	28%	0%	0%	68%	16%	8%	8%
	COLLEGE PLACE	51	16%	16%	69%	59%	4%	0%	35%	2%	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	80%	16%	4%	0%
	EASTSIDE TERRACE	50	14%	30%	56%	56%	12%	0%	30%	2%	16%	64%	20%	0%	0%	80%	14%	4%	2%
	FOREST GROVE	24	24%	16%	60%	64%	4%	0%	28%	4%	0%	88%	12%	0%	0%	76%	20%	4%	0%
	JUANITA COURT	30	23%	23%	53%	53%	7%	0%	33%	7%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	77%	13%	7%	3%
	JUANITA TRACE	30	13%	13%	73%	67%	3%	0%	23%	7%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	60%	27%	10%	3%
	JUANITA TRACE II	9	33%	0%	67%	67%	11%	0%	22%	0%	0%	44%	56%	0%	0%	78%	22%	0%	0%
	KIRKWOOD TERRACE	27	19%	11%	70%	63%	19%	0%	19%	0%	0%	78%	22%	0%	0%	81%	15%	4%	0%
	WELLSWOOD	30	33%	17%	50%	77%	7%	0%	7%	10%	0%	83%	17%	0%	0%	77%	20%	0%	3%
	Subtotal	305	18%	16%	66%	62%	8%	0%	25%	5%	3%	70%	26%	2%	0%	76%	17%	4%	2%
Southwest	CAMPUS COURT I & II	12	0%	17%	83%	25%	50%	0%	25%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	92%	8%	0%	0%
	PARK LAKE HOMES I	557	24%	19%	57%	23%	24%	1%	50%	1%	10%	62%	26%	3%	0%	88%	10%	1%	0%
	PARK LAKE HOMES II	163	26%	25%	50%	23%	22%	1%	53%	1%	27%	22%	41%	10%	0%	88%	10%	2%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE	30	33%	17%	50%	17%	43%	0%	40%	0%	0%	60%	17%	17%	7%	87%	13%	0%	0%
	SHOREHAM APTS	18	11%	6%	83%	28%	33%	0%	39%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	94%	6%	0%	0%
	VICTORIAN WOODS / FEDER	15	0%	13%	87%	27%	33%	0%	33%	7%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	93%	7%	0%	0%
Subtotal	795	23%	20%	57%	23%	25%	1%	49%	1%	12%	50%	33%	5%	0%	88%	10%	1%	0%	
Southeast	CASCADE APTS	108	14%	10%	76%	71%	19%	1%	6%	3%	7%	48%	44%	0%	0%	86%	10%	3%	1%
	GLENVIEW HEIGHTS	10	20%	10%	70%	60%	20%	0%	20%	0%	0%	60%	40%	0%	0%	80%	20%	0%	0%
	SPRINGWOOD	327	9%	11%	80%	61%	28%	2%	8%	1%	0%	36%	49%	15%	0%	94%	5%	1%	0%
	VALLI KEE	114	25%	17%	58%	59%	28%	2%	11%	1%	16%	23%	44%	18%	0%	87%	10%	2%	2%
	VISTA HEIGHTS	31	19%	10%	71%	61%	29%	0%	6%	3%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	65%	35%	0%	0%
	YOUNG'S LAKE	26	12%	8%	81%	92%	4%	0%	4%	0%	0%	15%	85%	0%	0%	69%	19%	8%	4%
	Subtotal	616	14%	12%	75%	64%	25%	1%	8%	1%	4%	34%	51%	11%	0%	89%	9%	1%	1%
South	BURNDAL HOMS	49	6%	22%	71%	80%	2%	0%	18%	0%	6%	33%	43%	12%	6%	84%	12%	4%	0%
	EVERGREEN COURT	30	20%	13%	67%	70%	13%	0%	13%	3%	0%	73%	27%	0%	0%	80%	17%	3%	0%
	FIRWOOD CIRCLE	49	12%	12%	76%	82%	8%	0%	8%	2%	8%	33%	39%	16%	4%	78%	14%	8%	0%
	GREEN RIVER HOMES	59	25%	20%	54%	73%	12%	0%	14%	2%	14%	51%	29%	7%	0%	88%	10%	2%	0%
	KING'S COURT	30	20%	20%	60%	67%	3%	0%	30%	0%	0%	70%	30%	0%	0%	90%	10%	0%	0%
	PICKERING COURT	30	17%	10%	73%	77%	10%	3%	3%	7%	13%	57%	30%	0%	0%	77%	17%	7%	0%
	Subtotal	247	17%	17%	66%	75%	8%	0%	14%	2%	8%	49%	34%	7%	2%	83%	13%	4%	0%
Grand Total: All Family Developments		2,100	19%	16%	65%	49%	20%	1%	28%	2%	8%	48%	37%	7%	1%	85%	12%	2%	1%

Appendix D: 2005 Mixed Population Public Housing Demographics

2005			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	70	23	47	0	52	5	0	10	3	0	70	0	69	1	0	0
	NORTHRIDGE I	69	31	38	0	48	3	0	17	1	42	27	0	67	1	1	0
	NORTHRIDGE II	70	22	48	0	50	3	2	15	0	0	69	1	65	5	0	0
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	29	38	3	53	3	0	12	2	37	32	1	66	3	1	1
	THE LAKE HOUSE	69	25	43	1	48	4	0	16	1	0	69	0	68	1	0	0
	Subtotal	348	130	214	4	251	18	2	70	7	79	267	2	335	11	2	1
East	CASA JUANITA	80	17	63	0	56	3	0	18	3	0	80	0	77	3	0	0
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	13	26	1	34	0	0	6	0	0	39	1	39	0	1	0
	FOREST GLEN	39	17	21	1	29	2	0	7	1	0	39	0	37	1	1	0
	Subtotal	159	47	110	2	119	5	0	31	4	0	158	1	153	4	2	0
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	38	31	1	33	23	0	12	2	0	70	0	69	1	0	0
	BRITTANY PARK	43	22	19	2	31	4	0	7	1	0	43	0	41	2	0	0
	MUNRO MANOR	60	36	24	0	40	9	0	4	7	0	60	0	57	2	1	0
	RIVERTON TERRACE	30	11	17	2	13	9	0	8	0	0	30	0	30	0	0	0
	YARDLEY ARMS	67	29	37	1	45	4	0	17	1	0	67	0	65	2	0	0
	Subtotal	270	136	128	6	162	49	0	48	11	0	270	0	262	7	1	0
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	3	58	0	56	2	0	3	0	0	61	0	60	1	0	0
	Subtotal	61	3	58	0	56	2	0	3	0	0	61	0	60	1	0	0
South	CASA MADRONA	69	14	54	1	66	0	1	2	0	0	69	0	64	5	0	0
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	4	31	0	30	0	0	5	0	4	31	0	35	0	0	0
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	70	6	64	0	65	0	0	5	0	0	70	0	70	0	0	0
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	79	10	69	0	34	1	1	42	1	0	79	0	79	0	0	0
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	17	50	0	62	3	0	1	1	36	30	1	65	2	0	0
	Subtotal	320	51	268	1	257	4	2	55	2	40	279	1	313	7	0	0
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,158	367	778	13	845	78	4	207	24	119	1,035	4	1,123	30	5	1

2005			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	70	33%	67%	0%	74%	7%	0%	14%	4%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	NORTHRIDGE I	69	45%	55%	0%	70%	4%	0%	25%	1%	61%	39%	0%	97%	1%	1%	0%
	NORTHRIDGE II	70	31%	69%	0%	71%	4%	3%	21%	0%	0%	99%	1%	93%	7%	0%	0%
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	41%	54%	4%	76%	4%	0%	17%	3%	53%	46%	1%	94%	4%	1%	1%
	THE LAKE HOUSE	69	36%	62%	1%	70%	6%	0%	23%	1%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	348	37%	61%	1%	72%	5%	1%	20%	2%	23%	77%	1%	96%	3%	1%	0%
East	CASA JUANITA	80	21%	79%	0%	70%	4%	0%	23%	4%	0%	100%	0%	96%	4%	0%	0%
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	33%	65%	3%	85%	0%	0%	15%	0%	0%	98%	3%	98%	0%	3%	0%
	FOREST GLEN	39	44%	54%	3%	74%	5%	0%	18%	3%	0%	100%	0%	95%	3%	3%	0%
	Subtotal	159	30%	69%	1%	75%	3%	0%	19%	3%	0%	99%	1%	96%	3%	1%	0%
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	54%	44%	1%	47%	33%	0%	17%	3%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	BRITTANY PARK	43	51%	44%	5%	72%	9%	0%	16%	2%	0%	100%	0%	95%	5%	0%	0%
	MUNRO MANOR	60	60%	40%	0%	67%	15%	0%	7%	12%	0%	100%	0%	95%	3%	2%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE MIXED	30	37%	57%	7%	43%	30%	0%	27%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	YARDLEY ARMS	67	43%	55%	1%	67%	6%	0%	25%	1%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	270	50%	47%	2%	60%	18%	0%	18%	4%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	5%	95%	0%	92%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	61	5%	95%	0%	92%	3%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%
South	CASA MADRONA	69	20%	78%	1%	96%	0%	1%	3%	0%	0%	100%	0%	93%	7%	0%	0%
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	11%	89%	0%	86%	0%	0%	14%	0%	11%	89%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	70	9%	91%	0%	93%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	79	13%	87%	0%	43%	1%	1%	53%	1%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	25%	75%	0%	93%	4%	0%	1%	1%	54%	45%	1%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	320	16%	84%	0%	80%	1%	1%	17%	1%	13%	87%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,158	32%	67%	1%	73%	7%	0%	18%	2%	10%	89%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%

Appendix E: 2004 Mixed Population Public Housing Demographics

2004			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	69	21	48	0	52	4	0	10	3	0	69	0	68	1	0	0
	NORTHBRIDGE I	70	31	39	0	52	2	0	15	1	42	27	1	68	1	1	0
	NORTHBRIDGE II	70	22	48	0	51	3	2	14	0	0	69	1	65	5	0	0
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	31	36	3	54	3	0	11	2	37	32	1	66	3	1	0
	THE LAKE HOUSE	69	26	42	1	50	3	0	15	1	0	69	0	68	1	0	0
	Subtotal	348	131	213	4	259	15	2	65	7	79	266	3	335	11	2	0
East	CASA JUANITA	79	18	61	0	55	2	0	19	3	0	79	0	77	2	0	0
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	15	24	1	35	0	0	5	0	0	39	1	39	0	1	0
	FOREST GLEN	40	18	21	1	28	3	0	8	1	0	40	0	38	1	1	0
	Subtotal	159	51	106	2	118	5	0	32	4	0	158	1	154	3	2	0
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	42	27	1	35	25	0	8	2	0	70	0	69	1	0	0
	BRITTANY PARK	43	23	19	1	31	4	0	7	1	0	43	0	41	2	0	0
	MUNRO MANOR	60	34	26	0	39	9	0	4	8	0	60	0	56	3	1	0
	RIVERTON TERRACE	30	11	18	1	13	9	0	8	0	0	30	0	30	0	0	0
	YARDLEY ARMS	67	29	37	1	47	4	0	15	1	0	67	0	65	2	0	0
	Subtotal	270	139	127	4	165	51	0	42	12	0	270	0	261	8	1	0
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	3	58	0	57	1	0	3	0	0	61	0	60	1	0	0
	Subtotal	61	3	58	0	57	1	0	3	0	0	61	0	60	1	0	0
South	CASA MADRONA	69	12	56	1	66	0	1	2	0	0	68	1	62	6	1	0
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	4	31	0	30	0	0	5	0	4	31	0	35	0	0	0
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	69	6	63	0	64	0	0	5	0	0	69	0	68	0	1	0
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	80	8	72	0	34	1	1	43	1	0	80	0	80	0	0	0
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	15	51	1	62	2	0	2	1	36	30	1	66	1	0	0
	Subtotal	320	45	273	2	256	3	2	57	2	40	278	2	311	7	2	0
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,158	369	777	12	855	75	4	199	25	119	1,033	6	1,121	30	7	0

2004			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	69	30%	70%	0%	75%	6%	0%	14%	4%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	NORTHBRIDGE I	70	44%	56%	0%	74%	3%	0%	21%	1%	60%	39%	1%	97%	1%	1%	0%
	NORTHBRIDGE II	70	31%	69%	0%	73%	4%	3%	20%	0%	0%	99%	1%	93%	7%	0%	0%
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	44%	51%	4%	77%	4%	0%	16%	3%	53%	46%	1%	94%	4%	1%	0%
	THE LAKE HOUSE	69	38%	61%	1%	72%	4%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	348	38%	61%	1%	74%	4%	1%	19%	2%	23%	76%	1%	96%	3%	1%	0%
East	CASA JUANITA	79	23%	77%	0%	70%	3%	0%	24%	4%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	38%	60%	3%	88%	0%	0%	13%	0%	0%	98%	3%	98%	0%	3%	0%
	FOREST GLEN	40	45%	53%	3%	70%	8%	0%	20%	3%	0%	100%	0%	95%	3%	3%	0%
	Subtotal	159	32%	67%	1%	74%	3%	0%	20%	3%	0%	99%	1%	97%	2%	1%	0%
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	60%	39%	1%	50%	36%	0%	11%	3%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	BRITTANY PARK	43	53%	44%	2%	72%	9%	0%	16%	2%	0%	100%	0%	95%	5%	0%	0%
	MUNRO MANOR	60	57%	43%	0%	65%	15%	0%	7%	13%	0%	100%	0%	93%	5%	2%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE MIXED	30	37%	60%	3%	43%	30%	0%	27%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	YARDLEY ARMS	67	43%	55%	1%	70%	6%	0%	22%	1%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	270	51%	47%	1%	61%	19%	0%	16%	4%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	5%	95%	0%	93%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	61	5%	95%	0%	93%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	98%	2%	0%	0%
South	CASA MADRONA	69	17%	81%	1%	96%	0%	1%	3%	0%	0%	99%	1%	90%	9%	1%	0%
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	11%	89%	0%	86%	0%	0%	14%	0%	11%	89%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	69	9%	91%	0%	93%	0%	0%	7%	0%	0%	100%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	80	10%	90%	0%	43%	1%	1%	54%	1%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	22%	76%	1%	93%	3%	0%	3%	1%	54%	45%	1%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	320	14%	85%	1%	80%	1%	1%	18%	1%	13%	87%	1%	97%	2%	1%	0%
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,158	32%	67%	1%	74%	6%	0%	17%	2%	10%	89%	1%	97%	3%	1%	0%

Appendix F: 2003 Mixed Population Public Housing Demographics

2003			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	70	19	51	0	57	3	0	9	1	0	70	0	68	2	0	0
	NORTHBRIDGE I	70	28	41	1	54	2	0	14	0	42	27	1	69	1	0	0
	NORTHBRIDGE II	70	22	48	0	50	4	2	14	0	0	69	1	67	3	0	0
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	69	35	32	2	55	3	0	9	2	36	32	1	65	3	1	0
	THE LAKE HOUSE	70	26	43	1	53	2	0	14	1	0	70	0	68	2	0	0
	Subtotal	349	130	215	4	269	14	2	60	4	78	268	3	337	11	1	0
East	CASA JUANITA	79	15	64	0	59	3	0	15	2	0	79	0	78	1	0	0
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	12	28	0	36	0	0	4	0	0	39	1	40	0	0	0
	FOREST GLEN	40	15	24	1	31	1	0	7	1	0	40	0	38	2	0	0
	Subtotal	159	42	116	1	126	4	0	26	3	0	158	1	156	3	0	0
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	36	33	1	36	23	1	6	4	0	70	0	69	1	0	0
	BRITTANY PARK	42	25	17	0	30	7	0	4	1	0	42	0	38	4	0	0
	MUNRO MANOR	59	32	26	1	38	10	0	5	6	0	59	0	56	3	0	0
	RIVERTON TERRACE	30	10	20	0	14	6	1	9	0	0	30	0	30	0	0	0
	YARDLEY ARMS	68	28	40	0	48	6	0	12	2	0	68	0	66	2	0	0
	Subtotal	269	131	136	2	166	52	2	36	13	0	269	0	259	10	0	0
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	5	56	0	57	1	0	3	0	0	61	0	61	0	0	0
	Subtotal	61	5	56	0	57	1	0	3	0	0	61	0	61	0	0	0
South	CASA MADRONA	69	16	52	1	67	0	0	2	0	0	69	0	62	7	0	0
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	2	33	0	31	1	0	3	0	4	31	0	35	0	0	0
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	70	12	58	0	63	1	0	6	0	0	70	0	69	0	1	0
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	80	6	73	1	33	1	1	44	1	0	80	0	80	0	0	0
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	16	50	1	63	2	0	0	2	36	30	1	65	2	0	0
	Subtotal	321	52	266	3	257	5	1	55	3	40	280	1	311	9	1	0
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,159	360	789	10	875	76	5	180	23	118	1,036	5	1,124	33	2	0

2003			Household Type			Race / Ethnic Group					Unit Size (# of Bedrooms)			Income Groups (as % of Area Median Income)			
Area	DEVELOPMENT NAME	Total Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	0	1	2	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	>80%
North	BRIARWOOD	70	27%	73%	0%	81%	4%	0%	13%	1%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	NORTHBRIDGE I	70	40%	59%	1%	77%	3%	0%	20%	0%	60%	39%	1%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	NORTHBRIDGE II	70	31%	69%	0%	71%	6%	3%	20%	0%	0%	99%	1%	96%	4%	0%	0%
	PARAMOUNT HOUSE	69	51%	46%	3%	80%	4%	0%	13%	3%	52%	46%	1%	94%	4%	1%	0%
	THE LAKE HOUSE	70	37%	61%	1%	76%	3%	0%	20%	1%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	349	37%	62%	1%	77%	4%	1%	17%	1%	22%	77%	1%	97%	3%	0%	0%
East	CASA JUANITA	80	19%	81%	0%	75%	4%	0%	19%	3%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	30%	70%	0%	90%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	98%	3%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	FOREST GLEN	40	38%	60%	3%	78%	3%	0%	18%	3%	0%	100%	0%	95%	5%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	160	26%	73%	1%	79%	3%	0%	16%	2%	0%	99%	1%	98%	2%	0%	0%
Southwest	BOULEVARD MANOR	70	51%	47%	1%	51%	33%	1%	9%	6%	0%	100%	0%	99%	1%	0%	0%
	BRITTANY PARK	43	60%	40%	0%	71%	17%	0%	10%	2%	0%	100%	0%	90%	10%	0%	0%
	MUNRO MANOR	60	54%	44%	2%	64%	17%	0%	8%	10%	0%	100%	0%	95%	5%	0%	0%
	RIVERTON TERRACE MIXED	30	33%	67%	0%	47%	20%	3%	30%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	YARDLEY ARMS	66	41%	59%	0%	71%	9%	0%	18%	3%	0%	100%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	269	49%	51%	1%	62%	19%	1%	13%	5%	0%	100%	0%	96%	4%	0%	0%
Southeast	MARDI GRAS	61	8%	92%	0%	93%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	61	8%	92%	0%	93%	2%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
South	CASA MADRONA	69	23%	75%	1%	97%	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	100%	0%	90%	10%	0%	0%
	GUSTAVES MANOR	35	6%	94%	0%	89%	3%	0%	9%	0%	11%	89%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	PLAZA SEVENTEEN	70	17%	83%	0%	90%	1%	0%	9%	0%	0%	100%	0%	99%	0%	1%	0%
	SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	79	8%	91%	1%	41%	1%	1%	55%	1%	0%	100%	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%
	WAYLAND ARMS	67	24%	75%	1%	94%	3%	0%	0%	3%	54%	45%	1%	97%	3%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	320	16%	83%	1%	80%	2%	0%	17%	1%	12%	87%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%
Grand Total: All Mixed Developments		1,159	31%	68%	1%	75%	7%	0%	16%	2%	10%	89%	0%	97%	3%	0%	0%

Appendix G: Section 8 Program Demographics 2005

				Area Median Income				Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms						
	Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6+
Tenant-Based	MTW Block Grant	787	\$ 11,339	770	15	2	0	151	22	614	324	381	13	26	36	7	0	31	308	314	102	31	1
	Access	31	\$ 7,544	31	0	0	0	28	0	3	20	8	0	0	3	0	0	24	6	1	0	0	0
	Allocation	1,039	\$ 8,795	1,036	4	0	0	937	81	22	785	202	8	20	21	4	1	770	241	22	5	1	0
	FUP	153	\$ 13,572	143	10	0	0	23	0	130	88	39	5	6	14	1	0	8	71	51	20	3	0
	HOPE VI Rel/Repl	261	\$ 13,110	248	12	1	0	68	43	150	86	80	5	85	3	2	0	49	130	56	25	1	0
	Mainstream	213	\$ 11,236	209	2	2	0	92	100	21	144	50	3	5	8	3	0	81	91	33	6	2	0
	WTW	611	\$ 12,701	575	34	2	0	81	21	509	284	252	12	24	31	8	0	24	264	246	62	14	1
	General Vouchers	2,531	\$ 13,306	2,402	120	10	0	664	626	1242	1,466	809	33	119	89	15	1	790	880	639	153	66	3
	Port-Ins	1,924	\$ 12,586	1,834	86	4	0	521	165	1238	842	841	24	126	72	19	0	350	754	611	164	43	2
	Other Programs	251	\$ 14,328	240	10	0	1	85	18	148	175	51	1	10	10	4	0	49	87	89	23	3	0
	Subtotal	7,801	\$ 12,233	7,488	293	21	1	2,650	1,076	4,077	4,214	2,713	104	421	287	63	2	2,176	2,832	2,062	560	164	7
Project-Based	Allocation	20	\$ 23,624	11	9	0	0	14	4	2	17	2	0	0	1	0	0	6	1	2	10	1	0
	Other Programs	203	\$ 11,129	200	3	0	0	14	51	138	131	36	1	20	13	2	1	51	106	42	3	0	0
	Subtotal	223	\$ 12,249	211	12	0	0	28	55	140	148	38	1	20	14	2	1	57	107	44	13	1	0
All	Total	8,024	\$ 12,234	7,699	305	21	1	2,678	1,131	4,217	4,362	2,751	105	441	301	65	3	2,233	2,939	2,106	573	165	7

Data does not include port-outs

General = General-purpose vouchers and all special-purpose vouchers no longer required to be treated as special-purpose

				Area Median Income				Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms						
	Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6
Tenant-Based	MTW Block Grant	10%	93%	98%	2%	0%	0%	19%	3%	78%	41%	48%	2%	3%	5%	1%	0%	4%	39%	40%	13%	4%	0%
	Access	0%	62%	100%	0%	0%	0%	90%	0%	10%	65%	26%	0%	0%	10%	0%	0%	77%	19%	3%	0%	0%	0%
	Allocation	13%	72%	100%	0%	0%	0%	90%	8%	2%	76%	19%	1%	2%	2%	0%	0%	74%	23%	2%	0%	0%	0%
	FUP	2%	111%	93%	7%	0%	0%	15%	0%	85%	58%	25%	3%	4%	9%	1%	0%	5%	46%	33%	13%	2%	0%
	HOPE VI Rel/Repl	3%	107%	95%	5%	0%	0%	26%	16%	57%	33%	31%	2%	33%	1%	1%	0%	19%	50%	21%	10%	0%	0%
	Mainstream	3%	92%	98%	1%	1%	0%	43%	47%	10%	68%	23%	1%	2%	4%	1%	0%	38%	43%	15%	3%	1%	0%
	WTW	8%	ppem	94%	6%	0%	0%	13%	3%	83%	46%	41%	2%	4%	5%	1%	0%	4%	43%	40%	10%	2%	0%
	General Vouchers	32%	109%	95%	5%	0%	0%	26%	25%	49%	58%	32%	1%	5%	4%	1%	0%	31%	35%	25%	6%	3%	0%
	Port-Ins	24%	103%	95%	4%	0%	0%	27%	9%	64%	44%	44%	1%	7%	4%	1%	0%	18%	39%	32%	9%	2%	0%
	Other Programs	3%	117%	96%	4%	0%	0%	34%	7%	59%	70%	20%	0%	4%	4%	2%	0%	20%	35%	35%	9%	1%	0%
	Subtotal	97%	100%	96%	4%	0%	0%	34%	14%	52%	54%	35%	1%	5%	4%	1%	0%	28%	36%	26%	7%	2%	0%
Project-Based	Allocation	0%	193%	55%	45%	0%	0%	70%	20%	10%	85%	10%	0%	0%	5%	0%	0%	30%	5%	10%	50%	5%	0%
	Other Programs	3%	91%	99%	1%	0%	0%	7%	25%	68%	65%	18%	0%	10%	6%	1%	0%	25%	52%	21%	1%	0%	0%
	Subtotal	3%	100%	95%	5%	0%	0%	13%	25%	63%	66%	17%	0%	9%	6%	1%	0%	26%	48%	20%	6%	0%	0%
All	Grand Total	100%	100%	96%	4%	0%	0%	33%	14%	53%	54%	34%	1%	5%	4%	1%	0%	28%	37%	26%	7%	2%	0%

Appendix H:
Section 8 Program Demographics
April 2004

			Area Median Income				Household Type			Race / Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms						
Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6+
MTW Block Grant	839	\$ 10,025	771	39	0	0	145	25	669	357	407	13	27	16	19	0	21	334	355	100	29	0
Access	25	\$ 5,026	20	0	0	0	21	2	2	18	5	1	24	0	1	0	20	4	1	0	0	0
Allocation	1,074	\$ 8,493	941	40	4	0	959	86	29	788	225	9	6	8	20	2	773	266	19	13	1	0
FUP	195	\$ 12,866	122	25	1	0	33	0	162	119	50	5	5	8	7	0	9	94	65	21	6	0
Mainstream	246	\$ 10,705	212	9	4	0	116	108	22	163	61	4	32	5	8	0	84	116	38	5	2	1
WTW	776	\$ 11,851	610	70	7	3	94	26	656	355	344	13	167	23	9	0	31	347	304	78	16	0
General Vouchers	3,241	\$ 12,965	2,682	417	57	0	882	689	1,670	1,879	1,034	37	127	76	48	0	901	1,176	847	231	84	2
Port-Ins	1,889	\$ 11,918	1,655	208	26	0	512	149	1,228	830	825	21	0	34	52	0	317	751	619	157	45	0
Other Programs	0	\$ -	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	8,285	\$ 11,676	7,013	808	99	3	2,762	1,085	4,438	4,509	2,951	103	388	170	164	2	2,156	3,088	2,248	605	183	3

Data does not include port-outs

General = General-purpose vouchers and all special-purpose vouchers no longer required to be treated as special-purpose

			Area Median Income				Household Type			Race / Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms						
Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6
MTW Block Grant	10%	86%	92%	5%	0%	0%	17%	3%	80%	43%	49%	2%	3%	2%	2%	0%	3%	40%	42%	12%	3%	0%
Access	0%	43%	80%	0%	0%	0%	84%	8%	8%	72%	20%	4%	0%	0%	4%	0%	80%	16%	4%	0%	0%	0%
Allocation	13%	73%	88%	4%	0%	0%	89%	8%	3%	73%	21%	1%	2%	1%	2%	0%	72%	25%	2%	1%	0%	0%
FUP	2%	110%	63%	13%	1%	0%	17%	0%	83%	61%	26%	3%	3%	4%	4%	0%	5%	48%	33%	11%	3%	0%
Mainstream	3%	92%	86%	4%	2%	0%	47%	44%	9%	66%	25%	2%	2%	2%	3%	0%	34%	47%	15%	2%	1%	0%
WTW	9%	101%	79%	9%	1%	0%	12%	3%	85%	46%	44%	2%	4%	3%	1%	0%	4%	45%	39%	10%	2%	0%
General Vouchers	39%	111%	83%	13%	2%	0%	27%	21%	52%	58%	32%	1%	5%	2%	1%	0%	28%	36%	26%	7%	3%	0%
Port-Ins	23%	102%	88%	11%	1%	0%	27%	8%	65%	44%	44%	1%	7%	2%	3%	0%	17%	40%	33%	8%	2%	0%
Grand Total	100%	100%	85%	7%	1%	0%	33%	13%	54%	54%	36%	1%	5%	2%	2%	0%	26%	37%	27%	7%	2%	0%

Appendix I:
Section 8 Program Demographics
April 2003

			Area Median Income				Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms							
Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6+	
MTW Block Grant	883	\$ 8,632	883	0	0	0	125	10	748	383	428		12	27	15	18	0	6	397	375	81	19	5
Access	12	\$ 5,098	12	0	0	0	12	0	0	9	3		0	0	0	0	0	9	3	0	0	0	0
Allocation	806	\$ 8,163	777	29	0	0	735	54	17	597	167		8	17	4	13	5	700	79	10	12	0	0
FUP	167	\$ 13,210	140	24	3	0	23	0	144	101	40		5	7	6	8	0	4	82	63	16	2	0
Mainstream	244	\$ 10,498	229	13	2	0	103	119	22	172	55		4	5	3	5	1	111	95	33	3	1	0
WTW	623	\$ 12,319	545	74	4	0	69	23	531	302	260		6	26	21	8	0	36	298	231	45	11	2
General Vouchers	2,863	\$ 13,696	2,390	443	29	1	780	644	1,439	1,733	871		36	122	70	31	2	999	935	714	159	41	13
Port-Ins	1,655	\$ 12,009	1,452	191	11	1	412	132	1,111	725	730		22	109	33	36	0	322	629	551	124	27	2
Other Programs	0	\$ -	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grand Total	7,253	\$ 11,828	6,428	774	49	2	2,259	982	4,012	4,022	2,554		93	313	152	119	8	2,187	2,518	1,977	440	101	22

Data does not include port-outs

General = General-purpose vouchers and all special-purpose vouchers no longer required to be treated as special-purpose

			Area Median Income				Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms						
Program	Households	Avg Annual Income	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6
MTW Block Grant	12%	73%	100%	0%	0%	0%	14%	1%	85%	43%	48%	1%	3%	2%	2%	0%	1%	45%	42%	9%	2%	1%
Access	0%	43%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	75%	25%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Allocation	11%	69%	96%	4%	0%	0%	91%	7%	2%	74%	21%	1%	2%	0%	2%	1%	87%	10%	1%	1%	0%	0%
FUP	2%	112%	84%	14%	2%	0%	14%	0%	86%	60%	24%	3%	4%	4%	5%	0%	2%	49%	38%	10%	1%	0%
Mainstream	3%	89%	94%	5%	1%	0%	42%	49%	9%	70%	23%	2%	2%	1%	2%	0%	45%	39%	14%	1%	0%	0%
WTW	9%	104%	87%	12%	1%	0%	11%	4%	85%	48%	42%	1%	4%	3%	1%	0%	6%	48%	37%	7%	2%	0%
General Vouchers	39%	116%	83%	15%	1%	0%	27%	22%	50%	61%	30%	1%	4%	2%	1%	0%	35%	33%	25%	6%	1%	0%
Port-Ins	23%	102%	88%	12%	1%	0%	25%	8%	67%	44%	44%	1%	7%	2%	2%	0%	19%	38%	33%	7%	2%	0%
Grand Total	100%	100%	92%	11%	1%	0%	32%	14%	57%	57%	36%	1%	5%	2%	2%	0%	31%	36%	28%	6%	1%	0%

Appendix J: Combined Demographics Comparison - All Programs FY 2005 vs. 2003

Program Type	YEAR			Household Type			Race / Ethnicity						Unit size (# of Bedrooms)							Income Group (As a % of AMI)			
			Households	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	American	Asian	Latino	Other	Studio	1	2	3	4	5	6	0-30%	30-50%	50-80%	Over 80%
Section 8 HCV	2003		7,253	2,259	982	4,012	4,022	2,554	93	313	152	119	8	2,187	2,518	1,977	440	101	22	6,428	774	49	2
Public Housing	2003		3,259	752	1,134	1,373	1,901	494	24	776	64	0	118	1,196	1,006	783	143	13	0	2,919	278	47	15
		PH Family	2,100	392	345	1,363	1,026	418	19	596	41	0	0	160	1,001	783	143	13	0	1,795	245	45	15
		PH Mixed Population	1,159	360	789	10	875	76	5	180	23	0	118	1,036	5	0	0	0	0	1,124	33	2	0
2003: TOTAL Households Served:			10,512	3,011	2,116	5,385	5,923	3,048	117	1,089	216	119	126	3,383	3,524	2,760	583	114	22	9,347	1,052	96	17
Section 8 HCV	2005		8,024	2,678	1,131	4,217	4,362	2,751	105	441	301	65	3	2,233	2,939	2,106	573	165	7	7,699	305	21	1
Public Housing	2005		2,872	664	1,094	1,114	1,734	431	18	619	70	0	119	1,154	791	673	122	13	0	2,543	267	52	10
		PH Family	1,714	297	316	1,101	889	353	14	412	46	0	119	787	673	122	13	0	0	1,420	237	47	10
		PH Mixed Population	1,158	367	778	13	845	78	4	207	24	0	119	1,035	4	0	0	0	0	1,123	30	5	0
2005: TOTAL Households Served:			10,896	3,342	2,225	5,331	6,096	3,182	123	1,060	371	65	122	3,387	3,730	2,779	695	178	7	10,242	572	73	11

Appendix K:
Public Housing Waiting List Demographics
2005

2005			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	1,544	\$9,093	310	106	1,128	731	487		26	177	61	62	614	685	200	34	11
East	2,164	\$9,446	428	286	1,450	1156	488		27	315	106	72	936	880	302	46	0
Southwest	2,846	\$9,058	430	204	2,212	1052	1059		57	399	134	145	892	1,314	502	118	20
Southeast	2,400	\$7,953	396	207	1,797	1162	753		42	239	116	88	894	1,018	393	89	7
South	2,756	\$8,712	545	325	1,886	1419	758		45	291	116	127	1,135	1,047	430	119	25
Total Applications	11,710	\$8,826	2,109	1,128	8,473	5,520	3,545		197	1,421	533	494	4,471	4,944	1,827	406	63
Total Applicants	5,883	\$8,826	1,038	781	4,064	2,923	1,552		93	827	238	250	2,324	2,417	929	221	40

Note that Total Applications include duplicated applicants who submit applications for more than one area.

Applicant totals represent unduplicated numbers.

2005			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	13%	103%	20%	7%	73%	47%	32%		2%	11%	4%	4%	40%	44%	13%	2%	1%
East	18%	107%	20%	13%	67%	53%	23%		1%	15%	5%	3%	43%	41%	14%	2%	0%
Southwest	24%	103%	15%	7%	78%	37%	37%		2%	14%	5%	5%	31%	46%	18%	4%	1%
Southeast	20%	90%	17%	9%	75%	48%	31%		2%	10%	5%	4%	37%	42%	16%	4%	0%
South	24%	99%	20%	12%	68%	51%	28%		2%	11%	4%	5%	41%	38%	16%	4%	1%
Total Applications	100%	100%	18%	10%	72%	47%	30%		2%	12%	5%	4%	38%	42%	16%	3%	1%

Appendix L:
Public Housing Waiting List Demographics
2004

2004			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	1,382	\$9,660	255	115	1,012	634	434		20	211	46	37	508	625	211	32	6
East	2,010	\$9,675	385	263	1,362	1058	481		21	349	63	38	815	843	307	44	1
Southwest	2,430	\$9,413	337	178	1,915	887	904		51	448	77	63	716	1,142	454	102	16
Southeast	1,977	\$8,292	315	158	1,504	960	611		32	264	71	39	677	915	300	83	2
South	2,491	\$9,089	501	295	1,695	1307	667		38	350	71	58	974	951	440	104	22
Total Applications	5,178	\$9,203	930	700	3,548	2,594	1,340		79	906	137	122	1,976	2,157	857	188	32
Total Applicants	10,304	\$9,203	1,795	1,009	7,500	4,849	3,105		162	1,624	329	235	3,696	4,482	1,714	365	47

Note that Total Applications include duplicated applicants who submit applications for more than one area.
Applicant totals represent unduplicated numbers.

2004			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	13%	105%	18%	8%	73%	46%	31%		1%	15%	3%	3%	37%	45%	15%	2%	0%
East	20%	105%	19%	13%	68%	53%	24%		1%	17%	3%	2%	41%	42%	15%	2%	0%
Southwest	24%	102%	14%	7%	79%	37%	37%		2%	18%	3%	3%	29%	47%	19%	4%	1%
Southeast	19%	90%	16%	8%	76%	49%	31%		2%	13%	4%	2%	34%	46%	15%	4%	0%
South	24%	99%	20%	12%	68%	52%	27%		2%	14%	3%	2%	39%	38%	18%	4%	1%
Total Applications	100%	100%	17%	10%	73%	50%	26%		2%	17%	3%	2%	38%	42%	17%	4%	1%

Appendix M:
Public Housing Waiting List Demographics
2003

2003			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	997	\$10,626	174	129	694	506	264		18	140	38	31	429	377	157	30	4
East	1,296	\$10,891	175	237	884	707	265		19	216	67	22	542	508	206	39	1
Southwest	1,570	\$9,954	164	144	1,262	598	516		35	293	68	60	516	712	283	51	8
Southeast	1,436	\$9,115	134	168	1,134	745	381		29	173	57	51	488	648	255	41	4
South	1,529	\$10,256	187	215	1,127	838	362		30	193	59	47	595	578	284	59	13
Total Applications	6,828	\$10,086	834	893	5,101	3,394	1,788		131	1,015	289	211	2,570	2,823	1,185	220	30
Total Applicants	3,059	\$10,086	346	553	2,160	1,574	677		51	530	135	92	1,246	1,207	511	83	12

Note that Total Applications include duplicated applicants who submit applications for more than one area.

Applicant totals represent unduplicated numbers.

2003			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	15%	105%	17%	13%	70%	51%	26%		2%	14%	4%	3%	43%	38%	16%	3%	0%
East	19%	108%	14%	18%	68%	55%	20%		1%	17%	5%	2%	42%	39%	16%	3%	0%
Southwest	23%	99%	10%	9%	80%	38%	33%		2%	19%	4%	4%	33%	45%	18%	3%	1%
Southeast	21%	90%	9%	12%	79%	52%	27%		2%	12%	4%	4%	34%	45%	18%	3%	0%
South	22%	102%	12%	14%	74%	55%	24%		2%	13%	4%	3%	39%	38%	19%	4%	1%
Total Applications	100%	100%	12%	13%	75%	50%	26%		2%	15%	4%	3%	38%	41%	17%	3%	0%

Appendix N:
Public Housing Waiting list Demographics
Comparison 2005, 2004, 2003

FY 2005			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	1,544	\$9,093	310	106	1,128	731	487		26	177	61	62	614	685	200	34	11
East	2,164	\$9,446	428	286	1,450	1156	488		27	315	106	72	936	880	302	46	0
Southwest	2,846	\$9,058	430	204	2,212	1052	1059		57	399	134	145	892	1,314	502	118	20
Southeast	2,400	\$7,953	396	207	1,797	1162	753		42	239	116	88	894	1,018	393	89	7
South	2,756	\$8,712	545	325	1,886	1419	758		45	291	116	127	1,135	1,047	430	119	25
Total Applications	11,710	\$8,826	2,109	1,128	8,473	5,520	3,545		197	1,421	533	494	4,471	4,944	1,827	406	63
Total Applicants	5,883	\$8,826	1,038	781	4,064	2,923	1,552		93	827	238	250	2,324	2,417	929	221	40
Total Applications %	100%	100%	18%	10%	72%	47%	30%		2%	12%	5%	4%	38%	42%	16%	3%	1%

FY 2004			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	1,382	\$9,660	255	115	1,012	634	434		20	211	46	37	508	625	211	32	6
East	2,010	\$9,675	385	263	1,362	1058	481		21	349	63	38	815	843	307	44	1
Southwest	2,430	\$9,413	337	178	1,915	887	904		51	448	77	63	716	1,142	454	102	16
Southeast	1,977	\$8,292	315	158	1,504	960	611		32	264	71	39	677	915	300	83	2
South	2,491	\$9,089	501	295	1,695	1307	667		38	350	71	58	974	951	440	104	22
Total Applications	10,304	\$9,203	1,795	1,009	7,500	4,849	3,105		162	1,624	329	235	3,696	4,482	1,714	365	47
Total Applicants	5,178	\$9,203	930	700	3,548	2,594	1,340		79	906	137	122	1,976	2,157	857	188	32
Total Applications %	100%	100%	17%	10%	73%	50%	26%		2%	17%	3%	2%	38%	42%	17%	4%	1%

FY 2003			Household Type			Race/Ethnicity						Number of Bedrooms					
Area	Households	Avg. Annual Income	Disabled	Elderly	Family	White	Black	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other	1	2	3	4	5	
North	997	\$10,626	174	129	694	506	264		18	140	38	31	429	377	157	30	4
East	1,296	\$10,891	175	237	884	707	265		19	216	67	22	542	508	206	39	1
Southwest	1,570	\$9,954	164	144	1,262	598	516		35	293	68	60	516	712	283	51	8
Southeast	1,436	\$9,115	134	168	1,134	745	381		29	173	57	51	488	648	255	41	4
South	1,529	\$10,256	187	215	1,127	838	362		30	193	59	47	595	578	284	59	13
Total Applications	6,828	\$10,086	834	893	5,101	3,394	1,788		131	1,015	289	211	2,570	2,823	1,185	220	30
Total Applicants	3,059	\$10,086	346	553	2,160	1,574	677		51	530	135	92	1,246	1,207	511	83	12
Total Applications %	100%	100%	12%	13%	75%	50%	26%		2%	15%	4%	3%	38%	41%	17%	3%	0%

Note that Total Applications include duplicated applicants who submit applications for more than one area.
Applicant totals represent unduplicated numbers.

Appendix O: 2005 Section 8 Waiting List Demographics

FY 2005			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	810	\$9,982	480	227	24	31	31	31
Elderly	463	\$9,847	285	94	6	38	38	25
Family	3,260	\$11,669	1,327	1,258	106	189	189	235
Grand Total	4,533	\$11,094	2,092	1,576	136	258	258	291

FY 2005			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	18%	90%	59%	28%	3%	4%	4%	4%
Elderly	10%	89%	62%	20%	1%	8%	8%	5%
Family	72%	105%	41%	39%	3%	6%	6%	7%
Grand Total	100%	100%	46%	35%	3%	6%	6%	6%

Appendix P: 2004 Section 8 Waiting List Demographics

FY 2004			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	928	\$10,092	534	254	27	36	20	57
Elderly	573	\$10,615	351	105	6	48	15	48
Family	3,616	\$11,832	1,472	1,379	108	211	151	295
Grand Total	5,117	\$11,288	2,357	1,738	141	295	186	400

FY 2004			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	Native American	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	18%	89%	58%	27%	3%	4%	2%	6%
Elderly	11%	94%	61%	18%	1%	8%	3%	8%
Family	71%	105%	41%	38%	3%	6%	4%	8%
Grand Total	100%	100%	46%	34%	3%	6%	4%	8%

Appendix Q: 2003 Section 8 Waiting List Demographics

FY 2003			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	America n	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	1,552	\$9,598	911	420	49	60	44	68
Elderly	402	\$10,611	240	89	6	48	7	12
Family	4,796	\$11,652	2,011	1,865	156	280	178	306
Grand Total	6,750	\$11,117	3,162	2,374	211	388	229	386

FY 2003			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	White	Blace	America n	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	23%	86.3%	59%	27%	3%	4%	3%	4%
Elderly	6%	95.4%	60%	22%	1%	12%	2%	3%
Family	71%	104.8%	42%	39%	3%	6%	4%	6%
Grand Total	100%	100%	47%	35%	3%	6%	3%	6%

Appendix R:
Section 8 Waiting List Demographics*
Comparison of FY 2005 thru 2003

FY 2005			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	Native American					
			White	Blace	an	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	810	\$9,982	480	227	24	31	31	31
Elderly	463	\$9,847	285	94	6	38	38	25
Family	3,260	\$11,669	1,327	1,258	106	189	189	235
Grand Total	4,533	\$11,094	2,092	1,576	136	258	258	291
Total %	100%	100%	46%	35%	3%	6%	6%	6%

FY 2004			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	Native American					
			White	Blace	an	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	928	\$10,092	534	254	27	36	20	57
Elderly	573	\$10,615	351	105	6	48	15	48
Family	3,616	\$11,832	1,472	1,379	108	211	151	295
Grand Total	5,117	\$11,288	2,357	1,738	141	295	186	400
Total %	100%	100%	46%	34%	3%	6%	4%	8%

FY 2003			Race / Ethnic Group					
Household Type	Total Households	Avg. Income	Native American					
			White	Blace	an	Asian	Latino	Other
Disabled	1,552	\$9,598	911	420	49	60	44	68
Elderly	402	\$10,611	240	89	6	48	7	12
Family	4,796	\$11,652	2,011	1,865	156	280	178	306
Grand Total	6,750	\$11,117	3,162	2,374	211	388	229	386
Total %	100%	100%	47%	35%	3%	6%	3%	6%

* **NOTE:** The Section 8 Waiting List has been CLOSED since 2002.

Appendix S: Mixed Population Demographic Report

Designation Plan Status Report								05/02/2005
Development	Number of Units	Number of Tenants	Designation Target	Percent Elderly/ Near Elderly	Number Over or Under Target Pre-Implementation	Number Over/Under Target 5/2/2005	Action Required	
North								
BRIARWOOD	70	70	55	79%	2	0	Monitor for Next Vacancy	
NORTHRIDGE I	70	69	55	70%	7	6	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
NORTHRIDGE II	70	70	55	80%	2	-1	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
PARAMOUNT HOUSE	70	70	55	66%	12	9	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
THE LAKE HOUSE	70	69	55	76%	5	2	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
East								
CASA JUANITA	80	79	62	83%	-4	-4	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
EASTRIDGE HOUSE	40	40	31	78%	0	0	Monitor for Next Vacancy	
FOREST GLEN	40	39	31	73%	2	2	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
Southwest								
BOULEVARD MANOR	70	70	55	67%	11	8	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
BRITTANY PARK	43	43	34	60%	8	8	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
MUNRO MANOR	60	60	47	72%	5	4	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
RIVERTON TERRACE MIXED	30	30	23	73%	3	1	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
YARDLEY ARMS	67	67	52	69%	9	6	Freeze Admission of Younger HHs	
Southeast								
MARDI GRAS	61	61	48	98%	-10	-12	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
South								
CASA MADRONA	70	68	55	89%	-6	-7	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
GUSTAVES MANOR	35	35	27	94%	-6	-6	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
PLAZA SEVENTEEN	70	70	55	96%	-7	-12	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
SOUTHRIDGE HOUSE	80	79	62	93%	-14	-12	No Restriction on Younger HHs	
WAYLAND ARMS	67	67	52	82%	-2	-3	No Restriction on Younger HHs	